diocese

6/

Read again from page 75 to 84 -
Subject the holiness of the life, and
Call of God - and soundness in the
faith - are required in the ministry
of our Lord's Apostles - Keep in
mind what is laid down in diverse
authority see 4th 1 Tim 3-1-7-1
Titus 1st 5 to 9 inc -

Epistles - of Mrs.
Annie Joyner
Salem N C 1877.
See 4th 4-7-13

See Page 310 re explanation farmer

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

THE author of the following treatise, the late Rev. Thomas Powell, was a distinguished minister in the British Wesleyan Connection. He entered the ministry in 1823, and soon gained an enviable reputation for studious habits, extensive literary acquirements, and fine polemical talents. One who knew him well describes him as sound in argument, patient in research, homely in diction, and well supported by authorities. He is represented as a more effective writer than preacher—being somewhat "circuitous" in his method. This resulted, doubtless, from the thoroughness of his investigations, and the habit of exhausting what he took in hand, when engaged in his literary undertakings. Though extensively acquainted with the best authors in those departments to which he more particularly turned his attention, yet he was an independent thinker—he formed conclusions for himself. He used his library so as not abusing it—few men deferring so little to the authority of great and popular names, whether ancient or modern. It has been well said of him, that he

did not substitute tinsel for gold, or artificial flowers, fit only for decoration, in place of such as will refresh with their fragrance. However, he does not deal much with flowers of any sort—logic, not rhetoric, is his forte. He deals in facts and arguments, such as his opponents cannot parry, and such as they cannot but feel. His ruling passion *crops out* in the remark once made by him: "I almost long to be in some prebendary's golden stall, wholly at leisure to devote my days and nights to the work of defending the faith."

The sturdy blows which he leveled against that monstrous absurdity, prelatical succession, produced a powerful effect. High-church dignitaries flew to the defence of the "craft" by which they have their importance, if not their wealth. But alas for them! —court chaplains and *jure divino* vicars—they look like pigmies in the hands of a giant. They made the attempt to resist the power and wisdom with which he bore down upon their cherished dogmas, and it is believed they will "remember the battle and do no more." This course will be wise—it has been adopted by the successionists this side of the water. Some of them indeed have condescended to reply to it with the favourite weapon of priestly dandiprats, *a sneer;* but they are afraid to meet the man in a fair and honourable battle. Were they to undertake to answer this book, they could do no

more than nibble at some unimportant passages—the great chain of argument could not be broken in a single link.

As an independent thinker, and one who had the boldness to utter what he thought, his book may contain, here and there, a circumstantial or collateral point which we should perhaps express somewhat differently: but this does not affect the genuineness, pertinency, and force of the great mass of scriptural, historical, and rational argument which he has adduced in opposition to prelatical and popish arrogance, sectarian bigotry, and schismatical assumption.

THE EDITOR.

CHARLESTON, *Nov.* 11, 1854.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/apostolicalsucce0000powe

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THE writer of this essay is alone accountable for all its faults and defects. He has written it without the counsel or the help of any man, or of any body of men. He believes, and therefore he has spoken. Perhaps it will make him some enemies: this he would regret, as he desires, as much as lieth in him, to live peaceably with all men. If maintaining the truth should made him enemies, he cannot help it. Some may think that he speaks too freely on certain points, and as to certain orders of persons. All he can say is, that he thought *truth and piety* required it. He would give honour to whom honour is due; but he hopes he shall ever show the greatest courtesy to the truth of God. While men, or the ordinances of men, oppose not the truth of God, he would respect them, and would submit to them for the Lord's sake; but when they oppose that truth, either in principle or in practice, he would call no man father upon earth. The author makes no pretensions to style: he only regards words as a plain

man does his clothes—not for ornament, but for use and decency. The confidence of his language arises from the conviction of his own mind, and not from any design to impose his opinions upon others. He dislikes to read an author who does not appear to believe himself. If any choose to controvert his positions, he freely allows them the liberty which he has taken. His *design* is CATHOLIC, NOT SECTARIAN. Truth is his object: though his efforts should perish, yet he will rejoice in the triumph of truth. He commits his work to God and to his church, praying that the kingdom of our Redeemer may speedily come; that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may be established among us, and in all the earth, throughout all generations! Amen.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE author, on issuing a second edition of this Essay, embraces the opportunity of gratefully acknowledging his obligations to the public for their favourable reception of his work.

The difference between this second edition and the former one consists in the *addition* of some important arguments; in the *amplification* of others; and in the *increase* of highly important *authorities* from writers of great celebrity, but whose works are expensive, and rarely to be met with by general readers. One of the most important additions will will be found in the second sub-section of section 3, on the *apostleship* of bishops. On a mature re-examination of the works of high-church Episcopalians, the author perceived that this was a position which they esteemed of the *very greatest* importance, and in which they placed the greatest confidence. He set himself, therefore, to furnish a complete refutation of it. The reader is requested to give that sub-section a very attentive perusal.

It will be found that several of the additional notes contain an exposure of the fallacies in the "Vindication of the Episcopal or Apostolical Succession, by the Rev. J. Sinclair, M. A., of Pembroke College, Oxford, Fellow of the Royal Society, Edinburgh, Minister of St. Paul's Episcopal Chapel, Edinburgh, &c."

Dr. Hook having requested the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, chaplain in ordinary to the queen, to take up the defence of the high-church succession scheme, the honourable and reverend gentleman has done so; and his work having been announced by the doctor's party as a complete answer to the Essay, the author has added a critique on that work. He thinks the examination of these two specimens of defence by Mr. Sinclair and the doctor's chosen companion, Mr. Perceval, will suffice, and will show the reader how futile all such defences are, when tried on the principles maintained in this Essay.

The review of Dr. Hook's sermon, on "Hear the Church," having a very near affinity to the argument of the Essay, and that Review having been considered a complete antidote to the doctor's main fallacy, it is retained in the present edition.

A general index is added to the whole.

INTRODUCTION.

"STAND fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free," is a divine command. The truth of God, at the Reformation, made the Protestant churches free from priestly tyranny and the traditions of men. It is the duty of every Protestant to watch against all encroachments upon this liberty.

Popery commenced on the principle of *exclusiveness* and bigotry. "Out of the church is no salvation — the Church of Rome is the only true church — ergo, out of the Church of Rome, is no salvation." This is the logic of Rome, enforced, according to opportunity of power and circumstances, by excommunication and confiscation, by fire and fagot to the body, and perdition to the soul, against all who have dared to resist its claims.

All exclusiveness and bigotry generate intolerance. When any *part* of God's church asserts its right to the *whole* inheritance of his people, it publishes an act of *ejectment* against the rest; and the spirit that dictated the ejectment will, when circumstances seem favourable, endeavour to effect its object by persecuting those who do not admit this exclusive claim. To admit an unjust claim is to encourage injustice. Our Christian birthright is a trust from heaven; and we cannot "sell it for a mess of pottage," without an Esau's profaneness.

A certain class of men have, at different times since the Reformation, come forward to effect that in the Protestant church which Popery endeavours to effect as to the church universal. This they try to accomplish by a

sophistical method of teaching the doctrine of *apostolical succession*. By *this doctrine* they *excommunicate* all the *other Protestant churches in Europe*. This is done seriously and in earnest, and that, too, by men of considerable influence and learning. The writer is convinced that the broad absurdity of their arrogant pretensions will be sufficient to lead many to treat those claims with just contempt. However, there are some that seem willing to receive the bold assertions and pretensions of such men, as proofs sufficient to support their claims. Others, who do not believe them, would yet be glad to see plain reasons for rejecting them. It is for this class of persons, chiefly, that the following Essay is designed.

Another object with the writer is to develop the nature of *genuine Protestantism*, and to supply an *antidote to Popery*. Popery is a deep-laid scheme. Its principal BASIS is *priestly arrogance*, generating the direst tyranny. This is not founded on the WORD OF GOD, but in the *traditions* of men. This foundation must be exposed and broken up, or in vain shall we attempt to break the iron yoke of Popery. Now it is a matter worthy of the most serious and careful observation by the reader, that nearly all the great succession divines are semi-papists. Archbishop Laud is supposed to be the father of them. Among his distinguished disciples will be found Dr. Hickes, Bishop Taylor, the authors of "The Oxford Tracts for the Times," Dr. Hook, Vicar of Leeds, &c.

The reader may be surprised to find the celebrated Bishop Taylor represented as a semi-papist: let him read his "*Clerus Domini*," and his "Episcopacy Asserted," and he will see the evidence of the statement. Bishop Taylor's splendid talents have imposed upon many, and have gained him more credit than he deserved. Like many pious papists, he could write well upon devotional subjects; but he is no safe guide as a theologian. Dr.

Hook, and the authors of "The Oxford Tracts for the Times," are evidently introducing Popery into the Church of England, and spreading it in the nation.

Many of the clergy of the Established Church are strongly opposed to the errors of these men, and they have spoken out manfully in the pages of the "Christian Observer." They seem, however, to be very tender of this doctrine of *apostolical succession*. They perhaps think it is calculated to add importance to their ministry, in opposition to the Methodists and Dissenters. A spirit of exclusivness is, indeed, very general among the clergy of the Established Church.

An opinion, too, of the *divine right of episcopacy*, has spread extensively in the Church of England: most of its clergy seem willing to believe it. Hence, generally speaking, they are not the men from whom a refutation of this doctrine of apostolical succession is to be expected: yet it evidently increases Popery in the church and in the nation. Its exposure and refutation, therefore, may be a general benefit to Protestantism.

It will not be amiss here to obviate a difficulty that may arise in some minds. Perhaps some persons, especially the members of the Establishment, may think that the writer is attacking the church. If by "*the church*" they will understand the *principles of the Reformers*, Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Jewel, &c., on the *questions here discussed*, then he most unhesitatingly declares, that, with some trifling exceptions, he heartily embraces them, and means to defend them; but if by "*the church*" they mean the principles of such men as Archbishop *Laud*, and his disciples the *Oxford Tract*-men, *Dr. Hook*, &c., then he does controvert them; because he believes them to be unscriptural, anti-Protestant, exclusive, intolerant, and popish. The author, indeed, writes not to attack, but to defend. These men make the attack. The *con-*

sequence of their principles is to charge all other ministers as thieves and robbers; they try to trouble and frighten their flocks; they expect their gain by gathering those they never sought out of the wilderness: what sort of shepherds, then, should we be, to look with indifference upon such proceedings?

In prosecuting the subject, we shall first produce the *statements* of this doctrine of apostolical succession from the advocates of this system. We shall then endeavour to give the true *state of the question*, and refute the arguments advanced in *favour* of that system. In the next place, the arguments *against* these claims will be brought forward, showing the whole to be contrary to the principles of the Reformation, and leading to persecution and Popery. Lastly, the nature of the only *genuine* and absolutely essential *apostolical succession* will be briefly unfolded. The whole will be concluded with some practical inferences, and counsels of peace to the Protestant churches at large.

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

SECTION I.

STATEMENTS OF THIS DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION BY ITS ABLEST ADVOCATES.

THE design of the following pages is, first,—the refutation of certain errors fraught with pernicious consequences to the peace of the whole Christian church; and then the establishment of Scriptural truth in their place. To give the authors, accused of maintaining these errors, as fair a trial as the limits of this Essay will admit, we shall, in the commencement, introduce copious extracts from the works of the most distinguished among them. This will enable the reader to judge of the pertinence of the arguments against them. The importance of the subject, and the celebrity of the writers, will, it is hoped, prevent the extracts from appearing tedious.

We shall arrange them under three heads:—

1. As to their doctrine of apostolical succession;

2. As to the necessity of ordination by succession bishops;

3. As to the nullity or worthlessness of all other ordinations, and the ministrations belonging to them.

First, then, as to their doctrine of apostolical succession. Bishop Taylor's "Episcopacy Asserted" was published by *royal command*. He had splendid talents; and doubtless he exerted them to the utmost to please his royal master, and to support a cause which he enthusiastically admired. We select him as a leading advocate, to give the cause the fairest chance of success. He closes his argument for the *divine right* of this doctrine of apostolical succession, as follows:—"The *Summe* of all is this, that Christ did institute Apostles and Presbyters, or 72 Disciples. To the Apostles he gave a *plenitude* of power, for

the whole commission was given to them in as great and comprehensive clauses as were imaginable, for by virtue of it, they received a power of giving the Holy Ghost in confirmation, and of giving his grace in the collation of holy orders, a power of jurisdiction and authority to governe the Church; and this power was not *temporary*, but *successive* and *perpetuall*, and was intended as an *ordinary* office in the Church, so that the *successors* of the Apostles had the same right and institution that the Apostles *themselves* had, and though the *personall* mission was not immediate, as of the Apostles it was, yet the commission and institution of the *function* was all one. But to the 72 Christ gave *no* commission but to *preaching*, which was a very limited commission. There was all the immediate Divine institution of Presbyterate as a distinct order, that can be fairly pretended. But yet farther, these 72 the Apostles did admit in *partem solicitudinis*, and by new ordination or delegation Apostolicall, did give them power of administering Sacraments, of absolving sinners, of *governing* the church in conjunction and subordination to the Apostles, of which they had a capacity by Christ's calling them at first *in sortem Ministerii*, but the exercise, and the actuating of this capacity they had from the Apostles. So that not by *Divine* ordination, or *immediate* commission from Christ, but by *derivation* from the *Apostles* (and therefore in minority and subordination to them) the Presbyters did exercise acts of order and jurisdiction in the absence of the Apostles or Bishops, or in conjunction consiliary, and by way of advice, or before the consecration of a Bishop to a particular Church. And all this I doubt not, but was done by the direction of the Holy Ghost, as were all other Acts of Apostolicall ministration, and particularly the institution of the other order, viz. of Deacons. This is all that can be proved out of Scripture concerning the commission given in the institution of Presbyters, and this I shall afterwards confirme by the practice of the Catholick Church, and so vindicate the practices of the *present* Church from the common prejudices that disturbe us, for by this account, *Episcopacy* is not only a *Divine institution*, but the ONLY order that derives *immediately* from Christ."*

Dr. Hickes, another distinguished scholar and divine of

* Episcopacy Asserted, pp. 46–48, ed. Ox. 1642, 4to.

the Church of England, denominated bishop and confessor by the Oxford Tract-men, thus speaks:—"Bishops are appointed to succeed the apostles, and like them to stand in Christ's place, and exercise his kingly, priestly, and prophetical office over their flocks: can you, when you consider this, think it novel, or improper, or uncouth, to call them spiritual princes, and their diocesses, principalities, when they have every thing in their office that can denominate a prince? For what is a prince, but a chief ruler of a society, that hath authority over the rest, to make laws for it, to *challenge* the *obedience* of all the members, and *all ranks* of men in it, and *power* to COERCE them, if they will not obey? . . . They stand in God's and Christ's stead over their flocks, the clergy as well as the people are to be subject to them, as to the VICEGERENTS of our Lord. . . . . And the *successors* of the apostles, the bishops, like *spiritual princes*, exercise the same COERCIVE *authority* that they did in inflicting spiritual censures upon their disobedient *subjects*. It would require a volume to show you the various punishments with which they corrected their disobedience. They *degraded clergymen* from *their order*, and as for the people, they put down those who were in the uppermost class of communion into the station of penitents, and other inferior places: others they forbid to come further than the church doors, and those whom they did not so degrade, they often suspended from the sacrament. The contumacious both of the clergy and laity they punished with excommunication; from which, after very long and very severe penances, they absolved some; and others, who were enormous, and very frequent lapsers, they would not reconcile to the peace of the Church, but in the danger, and prospect of death. I need not tell you how much the ancient Christians stood in *awe* of the APOSTOLICAL ROD in the *hands* of their *bishops*, especially of excommunication, which they looked upon as the spiritual *axe* and *sword* to the soul, and thought more terrible than death."*

And Dr. Hook, the present vicar of Leeds, thus states his views on the subject:—"Some persons seem to think that the government of the Church was *essentially different* in the days of the apostles from what it is now, because

* On the Dignity of the Epis. Order, pp. 191. &c. Lond. 1707, 8vo.

they do not find the names and titles of the ecclesiastical officers precisely the same. For instance, as I have just said, he whom we now call a *presbyter*, or priest, was frequently styled in the *New Testament*, *a bishop*. But it is not for names that we contend. We ask what was the fact, and the *fact was this:* that the officer whom *we now* call a *bishop*, was at *first* called an *apostle*, although afterward it was thought better to confine the title of apostle to those who had seen the Lord Jesus, while their *successors*, exercising the *same rights* and *authority*, though unendowed with miraculous powers, *contented themselves* with the designation of bishops. After this the title was never given to the *second order* of the ministry. . . . . The prelates, who at this present time rule the churches of these realms, were validly ordained by others, who, by means of *an unbroken spiritual descent* of ordination, derived their mission from the apostles and from our Lord. This continual descent is evident to every one who chooses to investigate it. Let him read the catalogues of our bishops ascending up to the most remote period. Our ordinations descend in a direct *unbroken line* from Peter and Paul, the apostles of the circumcision and the Gentiles. These great apostles successively ordained Linus, Cletus, and Clement, bishops of Rome; and the apostolic succession was regularly continued from them to Celestine, Gregory, and Vitalianus, who ordained Patrick bishop for the Irish, and Augustine and Theodore for the English. And from those times an *uninterrupted* series of *valid ordinations* has carried down the *apostolical succession* in our churches to the present day. There is not a bishop, priest, or deacon, among us, who cannot, if he please, trace his own *spiritual descent* from St. Peter or St. Paul." *

In the next place, let us hear what is said about ORDINATION by succession bishops, even when wicked and heretical.

Archdeacon Mason's "Defence of the Church of England Ministry" was begun and completed by the patronage, and under the counsel of Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, and was dedicated to King James I. Its authority is high among the Church of England divines. He writes in the form of a dialogue, between a Romish priest, Philodoxus,

* Two Sermons on the Church and the Establishment.

and a Church of England divine, called Orthodoxus. The title of chapter eleventh, book 2, is this, "Does schism or HERESY take away the *power of consecration?*" He goes on to bring Philodoxus to confess that neither *heresy*, (p. 175,) nor *degradation from* the *office* of a bishop, (p. 176,) nor *schism*, (p. 180,) nor the MOST EXTREME WICKEDNESS, (*quamvis enim viri essent omnium sceleratissimi*, p. 178,) nor "ANY THING ELSE, can deprive a person once made a bishop of the *power* of giving TRUE ORDERS."

"Orthodoxus. *Quod candidè largiris, cupidè arripimus.*" The Church of England divine says, "*what you,*" the PAPISTS, "candidly grant, WE JOYFULLY EMBRACE!!" * Every pious reader must be grieved to the heart to see the defenders of an important section of the Protestant church *joyfully embrace* the impious position, that a bishop is a true bishop, though a *heretic*, and the MOST *wicked of men!* —and all for what? why, merely to keep up the figment of episcopal ordination and succession. Indeed this is inevitable on the exclusive scheme of episcopacy, *jure divino*. If this perishes, they suppose their Christianity perishes. It *must perish*, on their scheme, or *come through* the *hands* of the *moral monsters* of Rome. Hence these impious positions are *joyfully embraced* to defend it.

Lastly, these authors say, that *no ordinations* but such as are performed by succession bishops are valid and divine. This, also, with them is a necessary consequence. Thus Bishop Taylor: "Without (the offices of episcopacy,) *no priest, no ordination, no consecration of the sacrament, no absolution, no rite, or sacrament*, legitimately can be performed in order to eternity."†

The learned Dodwell declares—"NONE but the *bishop* can unite us to the Father and the Son. Whence it will further follow that *whoever* are *disunited* from the visible communion of the Church on earth, and particularly *from* that visible communion of *the bishop*, *must* consequently be *disunited* from the whole visible catholic Church on earth; and not only so, but from the invisible communion of the holy angels and saints in heaven, and, which is yet more, *from Christ* and *God himself*. . . . It is *one* of the *most dreadful aggravations* of the condition of the DAMNED that

* Vindiciæ Eccles. Anglicanæ, edit. sec. fol. Lond., 1638.
† Episcopacy Asserted, p. 197.

they are banished from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power. The SAME is their condition also *who are disunited* from Christ by being disunited from *his* visible *representative,"* (the bishop).*

Dr. Hook, on this point, says, "You will observe *how important* all this is which I have now laid before you. Unless Christ be spiritually present with the ministers of religion in their services, those *services* will be VAIN. But the ONLY ministrations to which he has PROMISED his presence is to those of the BISHOPS who are successors of the first commissioned apostles, and the *other clergy* acting *under* THEIR sanction, and *by* THEIR AUTHORITY."

"I know the outcry which is raised against this—the doctrine of the Christian Church for eighteen hundred years—I know the outcry that is raised against it by *those sects* which can trace their origin no higher than to some celebrated preacher at the *Reformation*. But I disregard it, because I shall, by God's help, continue to do, what I have done ever since I came among you—namely, declare the whole counsel of God, *without regard to consequences* or respect of persons, and at the same time, as far as in me lies, live peaceably with all men."†

A passage or two from the Oxford "Tracts for the Times" may suffice, though all their volumes are impregnated with the same principles.

"The *hold*," say they, "which the propagandists of the 'Holy Discipline' obtained on the *fancies* and *affections* of the people, of whatever rank, age, and sex, depended very much on their *incessant appeals* to their *fancied apostolical succession*. They found persons willing and eager to suffer or rebel, as the case might be, for their system; *because* they had *possessed* them with the *notion*, that it was the system handed down from the apostles, 'a divine episcopate;' so Beza called it. *Why* should *we despair* of obtaining, in time, an *influence*, far more legitimate and less dangerously exciting, but equally searching and extensive, by the *diligent inculcation* of our *true* and *Scriptural* claim?"‡

* One Altar and One Priesthood, 1683, pp. 387 and 397.

† Two Sermons on the Church and the Establishment; and see Hickes on the Christian Priesthood, Pref. 194.

‡ No. 4, p. 7.

"I fear we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built,—OUR APOSTOLICAL DESCENT."*

"A person NOT COMMISSIONED from the *bishop*, may use the words of *baptism*, and sprinkle or bathe with the water, on earth, but there is *no promise* from Christ, that such a man shall admit *souls* to the kingdom of heaven. A person *not* commissioned may *break bread*, and *pour* out *wine*, and PRETEND to give the Lord's supper, but it can afford *no comfort* to any to receive it at his hands, because there is *no warrant* from Christ to lead communicants to suppose that while he does so here on earth, they will be partakers in the Saviour's heavenly body and blood. And as for the *person himself*, who takes upon himself without warrant to minister in holy things, he is all the while treading in the footsteps of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, whose AWFUL PUNISHMENT you read of in the book of Numbers. (Compare Numbers xvi with Jude 11.")†

Here the reader sees the main features of this system; —a system supported by a large number of learned and influential divines in the Church of England since the time of Archbishop Laud. It has lately been revived by the authors of the Oxford "Tracts for the Times," Dr. Hook, vicar of Leeds, &c. This doctrine is the ROOT of all their errors and Popish proceedings. By such a scheme as this they FORGE A CHAIN TO BIND HEAVEN AND EARTH, GOD AND MAN, TO THE ACTS OF PRIESTLY ARROGANCE. Allow the above doctrine, and though *Satan and his host incarnate* should become ordained by succession bishops, yet no ordinances but such as they administer have the promise of Christ, but are all vain! This scheme of Anglican-Popery will be seen to have a little variation in its machinery from Roman-Popery; but they are both animated by the same genius, and both terminate in the same consequences.

The reader will not regret to see, in the commencement of this Essay, the opinions of two celebrated foreign Protestant divines on this subject: the one, of the Lutheran church, and the other, of the reformed French church. *Chemnitius*, a greatly admired Lutheran divine, in his admirable Examination or Confutation of the Council of Trent, says, "By this measure, they (the Papists) endeavour not

*No. 1, p. 2. †No. 35, pp. 2, 3.

so much to reproach our (the Protestant) churches, as, at one stroke, to give a *mortal stab*, and to destroy them from the foundation. In their clamours by which they labour to establish this point, they contend, that in our churches is *no* true and legitimate administering of the *sacraments;* that God by our labours will give *no blessing, no pardon, no remission of sins;* that we can have no true sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; that all our *ministers* are thieves and robbers, not having entered by the true door" (of apostolical succession) "into the sheepfold. An atrocious denunciation indeed! And they give no reason for it but this, that the ministers of our (Protestant) churches are not called, sent forth, ordained, shaven, and anointed by Popish bishops."*

Now it is clear that there is a perfect identity in the matter urged against the reformers by the Papists, and that urged by high Church of England clergymen against all Protestants who have not episcopal ordination. If the latter have not ventured to be so bold in their denunciations, we can easily see the reason. They know the full consequences, boldly declared, would, with many Protestants, even in the Church of England, work as an *argumentum ad absurdum:* the absurdity would produce reaction. They, therefore, generally throw it out to work upon weak, credulous, unsuspecting, or bigoted minds.

Claude, in his able Defence of the Reformation, says. "And to speak my own thoughts freely, it seems to me, that that firm opinion of the absolute *necessity of episcopacy*, that goes so high as to own no church, or call, or ministry, or sacraments, or salvation in the world, where there are no episcopal ordinations, although there should be the *true faith*, the *true doctrine*, and *piety* there; and which would that ALL RELIGION should depend on a FORMALITY, and even on a formality that we have shown to be of no other than *humane institution:* that opinion, I say, cannot be lookt on otherwise then as the very worst character and mark of the highest hypocrisy, a piece of Pharisaism throughout, that strains at a gnat when it swallows a camel, and I cannot avoid having at least a contempt of those kind of thoughts, and a compassion for those who fill their heads with them."†

* Pt. ii, p. 421, fol. Genev., 1634. † Pt. iv, p. 97, 4to. Lond., 1683.

SECTION II.

THE STATE OF THE GENERAL QUESTION.

HAVING exhibited a general view of the doctrine of succession as taught by these high Churchmen, it may now be proper to clear our way by giving the true state of the question.

The succession divines maintain,—

1. That *bishops* are, by DIVINE RIGHT, an order *superior* to, *distinct* from, and having *powers, authority*, and *rights incompatible* with *presbyters*, simply as presbyters:

2. That the bishops of this order are the SOLE SUCCESSORS of the apostles as ORDAINERS of other ministers, and GOVERNORS both of pastors and people:

3. That this succession is a PERSONAL SUCCESSION, viz.—that it is to be traced through an historical series of persons, validly ordained as bishops, transmitting, in an *unbroken line*, this episcopal order and power to the latest generations:

4. That *no ministry* is VALID, except it have THIS *episcopal ordination*; and that ALL *ordinances* and *sacraments* are VAIN, except they be administered by such *episcopally* ordained ministers.

Now we deny every one of these positions. And we shall show,—

1. That *bishops* and *presbyters* are, by *divine right*, the SAME ORDER; and that presbyters, by divine right, have the same power and authority as bishops: that ORDINATION by presbyters is *equally valid* with that of bishops; and, consequently, that the *ministry* of all the reformed Protestant churches is *equally valid* with that of any episcopal church:

2. That *presbyters* are as much the SUCCESSORS of the apostles as bishops are:

3. That a *succession* of the *truth* of DOCTRINE, of *faith* and *holiness*, of the *pure word of God*, and of the *sacraments* duly administered, is the ONLY ESSENTIAL succession necessary to a Christian church:

4. That all are TRUE *Christian* CHURCHES where such a ministry and such ordinances are found.

Here it should be well observed, that the distinguishing character of the scheme we oppose, is its unchristian *exclusiveness* and *intolerance*. If its advocates had contended only for the lawfulness or *allowableness* of an *ecclesiastical* arrangement for a class of ministers whom they choose to call bishops, without excluding the presbyters of other churches from their Scriptural power and authority to perform all the duties necessary for the *being* and *well being* of the Christian church, this might have passed; but this does not satisfy them. Nothing will answer their design, but the degrading of the presbyters of those churches, and all presbyters, to an incapacity for performing those duties which God has committed unto them, and the setting up of an order of bishops, by *divine right*, with the SOLE and exclusive powers of ordaining ministers, and of governing them and the church to the end of the world. Again, if these writers had contended simply for the *importance* of a *succession* of pious ministers, in a *settled state* of things, in any church, as a *great blessing* to that church, and an encouragement to the faith of its members, without making an *unbroken line* of succession ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL in *all* states to the *very being* of a church, they would have acted commendably; and not a word of disapprobation of such a succession is found in this Essay. But this would have allowed, with the early Christian fathers, that the succession of apostolical FAITH and DOCTRINE is the ONLY ESSENTIAL succession: this, however, is too liberal for our high Churchmen: it would not answer their intolerant purposes. Bishop Taylor, the Oxford Tract-men, &c., solemnly maintain, that without an unbroken line of such bishops as their scheme maintains, and their ordinations from the apostles, there is no ministry, no promise of Christ, no blessings in any of the ordinances of religion; and that, consequently, the Scotch church, the Lutheran church, and all the Protestant churches in the world, are consigned, like heathens, to the uncovenanted mercies of God!

As an epilogue to this drama, these writers, after this excommunication, sometimes *affect* to feel *a little charity* for the excommunicated, and say, "We do not hurt them—the Church doors are open—they can come in if they

please—they shut themselves out, &c." Just so says Popery: "We are the church," say they,—"its doors are open." And they will "compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, they make him twofold more the child of hell than themselves."* But if a person does not see reason for the dominion of his holiness of Rome, for denying the evidence of his senses in their doctrine of transubstantiation, &c., then they consign his soul to perdition, and his body to the secular arm to be burned. If you say, "This is cruel," it is replied, "O! no: we pity him—we do not hurt him—the church doors are open—he may come in if he pleases—yea, we entreat him to come in—he shuts himself out—his blood must be upon his own head." The reader must determine whether or not this charity is from above.

We repeat, then, that in perusing this or any other work on the subject, the reader must never forget that the establishment of the *fact* of *some kind* of an order of bishops having existed in the church from an early period, and of the *fact* of an unbroken line from the same period, would not establish the system of these men. It might be allowed that both are *important* to the well being of a church; and yet it would not follow that they are *necessary* to the being of that church. No proof will do for the above scheme, but the proof that the Lord Jesus Christ has ABSOLUTELY *determined* that no ministers but such bishops as they feign shall convey this succession; and that WITHOUT this *unbroken line* of such bishops, and their ordinations from the time of the apostles, he will give NO *blessing* to the ministry or ordinances of any church under heaven, to the end of the world. No proof but this will suffice to the establishing of their monstrous scheme. If its advocates would act candidly and fairly, they should set themselves to produce this proof, or give up their cause. If the reader keeps this, the true state of the question, distinctly before his mind, their endless *assertions* and sophisms will be powerless; if he does not, he will, of course, be mystified and misled.

But though we thus state the subject, that the establishment of the *fact* of *some kind* of an order of bishops from an early period in the church, and the *fact* of an unbroken

* Matt. xxiii, 15.

line from the same period, would not support their scheme; yet, as to *such* an order of bishops as they contend for, and as to *such* an unbroken line of succession as they boast of, we DENY the FACT OF BOTH. God never instituted the first; and the last does not exist. All this will be clearly shown in the sequel.

This being the state of the question, the PROOF of their own propositions lies upon the succession divines. Their proofs must be Scriptural, clear, and strong. This is evident from the interests of both parties The interests of the succession divines and their followers require such proofs. They venture to suspend the validity of their own ministry and ordinances, and the whole Christianity of all their people, upon this doctrine: what wretched apprehensions, then, must they have, except their proof be Scriptural, clear, and strong. The interests of other Christian churches require this. The result of this doctrine, they are aware, is to excommunicate all the other Protestant churches in Europe. He that attempts this, should show cause why he does it. His own character requires this: this also is necessary for the conviction and conversion of the offenders, and for the satisfaction of the public mind. Bishop Taylor and some others have attempted it: we shall examine their attempts. Dr. Hook, indeed, is unwarrantably arrogant and insolent upon the subject. He says, among other arrogant things, in his "Two Sermons on the Church and the Establishment," "It is very seldom that the *clergyman* of the parish feels it to be worth his while to enter into controversy with the *Dissenting teacher*. He knows *his superiority*, and that he has nothing to gain by the contest." Now this is not so meek,—first to excommunicate you, and then to insult you for asking the reason for this sentence. "He knows his *superiority*, and that he has *nothing to gain* by the contest." Indeed! what, no justification for this tremendous sentence? What, then, has he something to lose here? Truth always gains: error and evil deeds only lose by the light. Dr. Hook may possibly find he has something to lose, if he has nothing to gain. It is a common trick with the Papists to be the most confident where they have least proof. They know many of their deluded followers will exercise an implicit faith in their assertions. This will

do—reasoning would possibly lead many to doubt—perhaps to do more. It is wise in such a cause to avoid it, and to treat your adversary with scorn. Why not? you have "*nothing to gain*" by the controversy. Dr. Hook, however, has favoured us with the outline of his scheme and argumentation. These we shall notice in their place.

Now though the *proof*, as we have said, lies upon these assertors of this personal succession scheme; and though no man ought to be required to *prove a negative;* yet as they are shy of their proofs, and in their stead give the world their important *ipse dixits;* and as their bold assertions may trouble many, an exposure of the baselessness and futility of these assertions may be useful. Let the reader remember, that if we can only show that a *reasonable "doubt"* lies upon any part of this scheme, that doubt will be fatal to it. If we show more; if we show *every* PROPOSITION to be DOUBTFUL;—yea, more still, every proposition to be BASELESS and FALSE: then the whole fabric falls to the ground.

SECTION III.

NO POSITIVE PROOF FROM THE SCRIPTURES OF THESE HIGH CHURCH CLAIMS.

WE will proceed to examine the *Scriptural* proofs adduced in favour of these high Church claims. Bishop Taylor has granted, (what every Protestant ought to insist upon,) that, except they have clear SCRIPTURAL grounds for these claims, the attempt to impose them on the church of God would be tyranny. "Whatsoever," says he, "was the regiment of the Church in the *apostles' time*, that must be perpetuall, (not so as to have *all* that which was personall, and temporary, but *so* as to have *no other*,) for that, and *that* ONLY is of divine institution which Christ committed to the apostles, and if the Church be not *now* governed as *then*, we can show no *divine authority* for our government, which we *must* contend to *doe*, and doe it, too, or be call'd USURPERS."* So says Chillingworth, in his immortal declaration,—"The religion of the Protestants—

* Episcopacy Asserted, p. 41.

is the Bible. The Bible, I say, the Bible only is the religion of Protestants! Whatsoever else they believe besides it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable consequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of opinion; but as matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require the belief of it of others, without most high and most *schismatical presumption.*"*

I ought to caution the reader on one point here—it is this, that he will not blame me if I do not bring forward any such arguments produced by these divines, out of the sacred Scriptures, as their cause might seem to demand. All I can say is, that I know of no arguments of this kind; and therefore I cannot produce them. I promise him I will produce the best I have anywhere found urged by these advocates for their scheme. Perhaps, however, in justice to some eminent writers in favour of episcopacy, I should say, that they substantially give up *direct* Scripture proof, and rely *chiefly* upon an induction from the testimony of the early Christian *fathers*. Thus, Dr. Hammond asks, "Who were the apostles' successors in that power which concerned the governing their churches which they planted? and first, I answer, that it being a matter of fact, or story, *later* than the *Scripture* can universally reach to, it cannot be fully satisfied or answered from thence—but will in the full latitude, through the universal church in these times be made clear, from the recent evidences that we have, viz., from the consent of the Greek and Latin *fathers*, who generally resolve that bishops are those successors."† The celebrated Henry Dodwell has probably never been surpassed in laborious ecclesiastical learning, and he devoted it all to the establishment of this system of *exclusiveness* on behalf of episcopal powers and authority. Now this high Church champion, after all his toil to establish these claims, fairly gives up all *direct* Scriptural authority for them. "The sacred writers," says he, "*nowhere* professedly explain the offices or ministries themselves, as to their nature or extent, which surely they would have done if any particular form had been presented

* Religion of Protestants, chap. vii, sec. 56.
† On the Power of the Keys, Preface.

for perpetual duration."* And the very learned Bishop Beveridge himself, another *exclusionist*, makes substantially the same acknowledgment. He says, "*Nothing* can be *determined* from what the apostles did in their early proceedings in preaching the gospel as to the establishment of any certain form of church government for perpetual duration."†

But let us proceed to the attempts made to find something in *Scripture* to support this scheme.

§ 1.—*The* COMMISSION *of Jesus Christ to the Apostles.*

Their first argument is taken from the *commission* of Christ to the apostles: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."‡ The scheme of high Churchmen *asserts* that this commission belongs to bishops *alone*, as the *exclusive* successors of the apostles, and as the *sole* rulers and ordainers of all other ministers to the end of the world. The *proof is wanting:* though Archbishop Potter tells us, that the passage before us "contains a *full declaration* of our Lord's *intention*."§ It would be idle to quote the attempts to supply this want of proofs by the reiterated assertions of these writers on the subject. The reader may see them in Bishop Taylor, sec. 3, Dr. Hook's Two Sermons, &c. The great reformers of the English Church thought very differently from these men; for they appointed this very commission as a part of the solemn office for ordaining all *presbyters:* thus most decidedly determining that they believed this commission to belong to *all presbyters*, as well as to bishops. There is not, indeed, a single syllable in the passage about *distinct orders* of bishops and presbyters. The whole commission plainly belongs *equally* to every minister of Christ, in every age, as it does to a bishop. The Lord made no distinction; and the servant that attempts it, attempts a tyranny over his brethren

* De Nupero Schismate, sec. 14.
† Cod. Can. Ecc. Prim. Vind., p. 317. Lond., 1678, 4to.
‡ Matt. xxviii, 19, 20. § Church Govern., p. 121, ed. Bagster, 1838.

for which he has no divine warrant. To see that our Lord intended no such thing as this proud scheme, let us hear him in other places on the relation of ministers, one to another. "But be *not* ye called *rabbi;* for *one* is your *Master*, even Christ; and *all ye* are brethren. And call no man your *father* upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters; for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted."* "But Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise LORDSHIP over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it *not* be among you; but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister; and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."† The only just conclusions that can be drawn from these passages are, that *all* ministers of the gospel are *equal* by divine authority; and that the only important distinctions before God will be those of deeper *piety*, more devoted *labours*, and greater *usefulness* to the church of God. "Whosoever will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all."

Great dependence is placed by others upon our Saviour's words in John xx, 21–23, "Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: *as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.* And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: *whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.*" Now this is just as inconclusive as the other: nay, the very *indefiniteness* of the Saviour's language, in both passages, is against them; for, had he meant what they would have him to mean, he would, in a matter, according to this scheme, so all-important, have said so; but he did not say so, which proves decidedly that he did not mean so. And here also, again, it is unfortunate for these writers, as belonging to the Church of England, that her reformers have indisputably shown, that, in their views, this whole

* Matt. xxiii, 8–12. † Mark x, 42–45.

passage, whatever power and authority it conveys, belongs PROPERLY *to presbyters*, as well as to bishops, by applying the *whole to presbyters* in the solemn act of *their* ordination to the ministry. We speak of the Book of Orders, or the Office for ordaining Priests (presbyters) and Bishops, as it was constituted by the great English reformers; and as it continued till 1661, when it was altered to what it is at present. See section vii, of this Essay.

§2.—*The Claim of* APOSTLESHIP *for Bishops.*

But it is said, and contended for, that *bishops* are *now* what the *apostles* were in their time. To be sure some things are excepted, as the pretence would otherwise immediately refute itself. Let us hear Bishop Taylor: "In the extraordinary privileges of the apostles they had no successors, therefore of necessity a successor must be constituted in the ordinary office of apostolate. Now what is this ordinary office? Most certainly since the extraordinary (as is evident) was only a helpe for the founding and beginning, the other are such as are *necessary* for the *perpetuating* of a church. Now in clear evidence of sense, these offices and powers are *preaching*, *baptizing*, *consecrating*, *ordaining*, and *governing*. For these were necessary for the perpetuating of a church, unless men could be Christians that were never christened, nourished up to life without the eucharist, become priests without calling of God and ordination, have their sinnes pardoned without absolution, be members and parts and sonnes of a church whereof there is no coadunation, no authority, no governour. These the apostles had without all question, and whatsoever they had, they had from Christ, and these were *eternally necessary:* these, then, were the offices of the apostolate, which Christ promised to assist for ever, *and this is that which we now call the order and office of episcopacy.* The apostolate and episcopacy which did *communicate* in all the power, and offices which were *ordinary* and perpetuall, are in Scripture clearely all one in ordinary ministration, and their names are often used in common to signify exactly the same ordinary function."* "*Imposition of hands* is a duty and

* Pages 14, 15.

office *necessary* for the perpetuating of a church, *ne gens sit unius ætatis*, least it expire in one age: this power of imposition of hands for *ordination*, was fix't upon the *apostles* and apostolike men, and NOT communicated to the 72 *disciples* or presbyters; for the apostles, and apostolike men did so *de facto*, and were commanded to doe so, and the 72 never did so, therefore this office and ministry of the *apostolate* is *distinct* and *superior* to that of *presbyters*, and this distinction *must* be so *continued* to all ages of the church, for the thing was not temporary but productive of issue and succession, and therefore as *perpetuall* as the clergy, as the *Church* itself."*

"For farther confirmation, says Bingham, "of what has been asserted, it will not be amiss here to subjoin next a short account of the *titles* of *honour* which were given to *bishops* in the primitive church. The most ancient of these is the title of *apostles:* which, in a large and *secondary* sense, is thought by many to have been the original name for *bishops*, before the name bishop was appropriated to their order. For at *first* they suppose the names bishop and presbyter to have been *common* names for all of the first and second order; during which time, the *appropriate* name for bishops, to distinguish them from mere presbyters, was that of *apostles*. Thus Theodoret says expressly, 'The same persons were anciently called promiscuously both bishops and presbyters, while those who are now called bishops, were' (then) 'called apostles. But shortly *after*, the name of apostles was appropriated to such only as were *apostles* INDEED; and then the name bishop was given to those who before were called apostles.' Thus, he says, Epaphroditus was the apostle of the Philippians, and Titus the apostle of the Cretans, and Timothy the apostle of the Asiaticks. And this he repeats in several other places of his writings."

"The author under the name of St. Ambrose asserts the same thing: 'That all bishops were called apostles at first.' And therefore, he says, that 'St. Paul, to distinguish himself from such apostles, calls himself an apostle, not of man, nor sent by man to preach, as those others were, who were chosen and sent by the apostles to confirm the churches.' Amalarius cites another passage out

* Page 27.

of this same author, which speaks more fully to the purpose: 'They,' says he, 'who are now called bishops, were originally called apostles; but the holy *apostles being* DEAD, they who were ordained AFTER them to govern the churches, could not arrive to the excellency of those first: nor had they the testimony of miracles, but were in many respects inferior to them: therefore they thought it NOT DECENT to assume to themselves the name of apostles; but, dividing the names, they left to presbyters the name of the presbytery, and they themselves were called bishops.'"

"This is what those authors infer from the identity of the names, bishop and presbyter, in the first age: they do not thence argue (as some who abuse their authority have done since) that therefore bishops and presbyters were all one; but they think that bishops were then distinguished by a more appropriate name, and more expressive of their superiority, which was that of secondary apostles."*

So Dr. Hook:—"The officer whom we now call *a bishop* was at first called an *apostle*, although afterward it was *thought better* to confine the title of apostle to those who had seen the Lord Jesus, while their successors, exercising the *same rights* and *authority*, though unendowed with miraculous powers, *contented themselves* with the designation of BISHOPS."†

The importance of these extracts must apologize for their length. Powerful efforts are sometimes made to hold up this system by claiming authority for it from the precedents of Scriptural bishops. This, however, its ablest advocates seem to be conscious is untenable ground. They find something more indefinite about the office of apostles. This makes it more easy to indulge in *suppositions* and *assertions*. Besides, the scheme is an imposing one: SOLE, *exclusive* successors of the apostles! What may they not do, if they can establish this? The world must bow to their awful authority. The pope has shown us what may be accomplished in subjugating the bodies, and souls, and substance of mankind, by *one* such successor: what would be the state of the world, then, were every bishop established as a pope in his diocess? To

* Page 21, vol. i, fol. Lond., 1726.

† Two Sermons on the Church and the Establishment.

say this is all exaggeration, is to contradict all past history and experience.

The nature of the subject, the boldness of these claims, and the confidence with which they are urged, demand a careful investigation of this APOSTLESHIP of bishops. But before we enter upon that investigation, it will not be irrelevant to notice, how these and similar advocates of this high scheme of episcopacy disagree with each other.

Bishop Taylor declares that, if this high Church scheme be not the same as was in the apostles' times, and if they "cannot show *divine authority* for it, they must be called *usurpers.*"* But the famous Henry Dodwell, one of its most learned and strenuous advocates, affirms, "That *all* the *reasoning* from which men conclude that the *whole model* of ecclesiastical discipline may be extracted from the writings of the *New Testament* is *very precarious.* There is," says he, "*no passage* of any sacred writer which openly professes this design. Indeed there is *not one* which so treats of ecclesiastical government, as if the author, or the writer's author, the Holy Spirit, had intended to describe *any one* form of church government as being to remain everywhere as for ever inviolate. The *sacred penmen* have *nowhere* declared, with sufficient clearness, how great a change must take place in church government when the churches should first withdraw from the communion of the synagogues. They *nowhere* clearly show how much was allowed to the personal *gifts* of the Holy Ghost, and how much to places and *offices.* They *nowhere*, with decided clearness, distinguish the *extraordinary* officers, who were not to outlive that age, from the *ordinary* ministers who were not to cease till the second coming of Christ. Indeed, all things of this nature were then so generally known, and they so suppose this knowledge in what they say, that they never for the sake of posterity explain them: concerning themselves only with present things, and leaving the future. They *nowhere* professedly explain the *offices* or ministries themselves, as to their nature or extent: which surely they would have done if any particular form had been prescribed for perpetual duration."†

The learned Dr. Bentley declares, that "our bishops,

* Episcopacy Asserted, p. 41. † De Nupero Schismate, sec. 14.

with all Christian antiquity, *never thought* themselves and their order to succeed the Scripture Επισκοποι, (bishops,) but the Scripture Αποστολοι, (apostles:) they were διαδοχοι των Αποστολων, the successors of the apostles.—The *presbyters*, therefore, WHILE THE APOSTLES LIVED, were Επισκοποι, *bishops*, overseers."* Yet Dodwell, superior to Bentley, in ecclesiastical learning, positively affirms that "the office of the apostles PERISHED *with the apostles:* in which office there *never was* any SUCCESSION to any of them, EXCEPT TO JUDAS THE TRAITOR." †

Let the reader also remark, here, that the scheme of the apostleship of modern bishops *fully concedes the point*, that bishops and presbyters were, in the apostles' days, one and the SAME ORDER. For these advocates never reckon more than three orders in the ministry, namely, (1.) bishops, whose appropriate name, they say, is apostles: (2.) priests or presbyters; and (3.) deacons. Now were we to reckon Scriptural bishops and presbyters as *distinct* orders, this would make, for the apostles' days, *four* orders; and would contradict their own enumeration of orders. It follows, therefore, that their plan of apostleship fully concedes that Scriptural bishops and presbyters not only had these names in common, so that presbyters were called bishops, and bishops were called presbyters indifferently, but that they were *really* one and the same order. Accordingly, Dr. Hammond says, that presbyters, as mentioned in Acts xi, 30, were bishops: also in Acts xiv, 23, and other places. And he says that the word presbyter was "*fitly* made use of by the apostles and writers of the New Testament, and affixed to the GOVERNORS of the Christian church."—"And although this title of presbyter have been also extended to a second order in the church, and is *now* only in use for them, under the name of *presbyter*, yet in the *Scripture times*, it belonged PRINCIPALLY, if not alone, to bishops, there being *no evidence* that any of that *second* order were then instituted." In plain English, the doctor fairly grants that presbyters, in *Scripture times*, were bishops, and bishops were presbyters: that is, they were *one* and the *same order and office*. And Bentley affirms that "presbyters, while the apostles lived, were bishops."

* Rundolph's Enchir. Theol., vol. v, p. 204.
† De Nupero Schismate, pp. 55, 68, ed. Lond., 1704, 12mo.

We proceed, however, to investigate further these claims of the rights and authority of apostles for modern bishops. Let us consider *whom* it is said they succeed, and to *what* they succeed. The claim amounts to this, that modern apostles, by voluntary humility called bishops, are the *exclusive* successors of the *twelve* apostles: that they succeed them in those rights and in that authority which no other order of ministers possessed; and that this inheritance is *indivisible*, that is, that it cannot belong to *two different orders* of men at the *same time:* yea, that it is itself the very *essence* of the *order* of modern apostles: so that no individual could possess it but he would, *by* the very *fact* of this *possession*, immediately *become* an *apostle himself.*

To establish their scheme, these advocates must show two things: 1st, that the order of the twelve apostles was to be an *ordinary*, *standing* order in the church; and 2dly, they must show *divine law*, POSITIVE *divine law*, for the exclusive succession of modern bishops to the rights and authority of these apostles. For if the order of the twelve apostles was *extraordinary* and *temporary*, the claim to succeed them in that which had no continuance beyond themselves is a vain presumption; and if there be no divine law for giving to bishops the exclusive rights and authority of the twelve, then the assumption of such rights and authority, without divine law, is an impious assumption, and an attempt at an intolerable usurpation in the church of Christ.

This being the state of the question, on this point, we come to inquire into the proofs.

The proofs produced are of two kinds: first, *Scriptural*, secondly, *ecclesiastical*. As this is a question of *divine right*, Scriptural authority *alone* can decide it. Ecclesiastical or human authority, as authority, is impertinent, and can decide nothing one way or another. However, we shall examine it in its place.

First, then, the *Scriptural* proofs. The claims being so high and awful, the proofs must be clear, plain, and powerful. Dr. Barrow's remarks on the *matter of proofs* as to the pope's supremacy will hold with equal force as to the supremacy of bishops. We shall insert them, with words in brackets, showing their application to this system.

"If," says he, "God had designed the bishop of Rome [*bishops as supreme* over ministers and people] to be for a perpetual course of times sovereign monarch [*monarchs*] of his church, it may reasonably be supposed that he would *expressly* have *declared* his mind in the case, it being a point of greatest importance of all that concern the administration of his kingdom in the world. Princes do not use to send their viceroys unfurnished with patents *clearly* signifying their commission, that no man out of ignorance or doubts concerning that point, excusably may refuse compliance; and, in all equity, *promulgation* is requisite to the establishment of any LAW, or exacting obedience. But in all the pandects of divine revelation, the bishop of Rome [or, *the supremacy of bishops*,] is NOT so much as ONCE mentioned, either by name, or by character, or by probable intimation: they cannot *hook* him [*them*] in otherwise than by straining hard, and framing a long chain of consequences, each of which is too subtle for to constrain any man's persuasion.—In the Levitical law all things concerning the high priest: not only his designation, succession, consecration, duty, power, maintenance, privilege of its high priest, [*of bishops as high priests*,] whereby he [they] might be directed in the administration of his [their] office, [of their *supremacy*,] and know what observance to require. Whereas also the Scripture doth inculcate duties of all sorts, and doth not forget frequently to press duties of respect and obedience toward particular governors of the church: is it not strange that it should never bestow one precept, whereby we might be instructed and admonished to pay our duty to the universal Pastor? [to these *supreme pastors?*] especially considering, that God, who directed the pens of the apostles, and who intended that their writings should continue for the perpetual instruction of Christians, did *foresee* how *requisite* such a precept would be to secure that duty; for if but one such precept did appear, it would do the business, and void all contestation about it."* Thus also speaks the learned Stillingfleet in his celebrated Irenicum: "We shall discuss the *nature* of a DIVINE RIGHT, and show whereon an unalterable divine right MUST be founded." Very well: now high

* Dr. Barrow's Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy, Supp. 5, p. 155, &c., ed. Lond. 1680, 4to.

Churchmen say that modern bishops have *divine right* to "the rights and authority of apostles." Let Stillingfleet state the *law* of the case.* "*Jus* (law) is that which makes a thing to become a duty: so *jus quasi jussum*, and *jussa jura*, as Festus explains it: that is, that whereby a thing is not only *licitum* (lawful) in men's lawful power to do it or no, but is made *debitum*, (duty,) and is *constituted a duty* by the *force* and virtue of a DIVINE COMMAND.—Whatsoever binds Christians as an universal standing *law*, *must* be *clearly revealed* AS SUCH, and laid down in Scripture in *such* EVIDENT TERMS, as all who have their senses exercised therein may discern to have been the *will* of Christ, *that it should* PERPETUALLY OBLIGE all believers to the world's end, as is clear in the case of baptism, and the Lord's supper." Let, then, such a law, such "a divine command, an universal standing law, clearly revealed as such, and laid down in Scripture in such evident terms, as all who have their senses exercised therein may discern to have been the will of Christ, that it should perpetually oblige all believers to the world's end"—let such a law be shown for the claim of the rights and authority of apostles as belonging to modern bishops, and the question is ended. We all cordially submit to, and acquiesce in, such a divine law. But, if no such law be produced: if no such law can be produced: if no such law ever was promulgated: then, to urge such a claim upon the consciences of all other ministers and people, and, on this baseless assumption, to pronounce all their ordinances void, all their ministers as Korah, Dathan, and Abiram: what is this but to curse those whom Christ has blessed? what, but to introduce a system of usurpation in the church of God, essentially destructive of its peace to the end of the world?

This for the nature of the proofs. But to proceed: it will be proper here, in order to avoid ambiguity, to notice the *different significations* of the term APOSTLE. The general meaning of the term apostle is, *one sent, a missionary, a messenger*. Accordingly, when the Saviour *sent* forth the twelve, he also, saith St. Luke, "named them *apostles*." These are called THE apostles, by way of eminence. Eusebius says, "The Lord Jesus Christ called *twelve* apostles, whom ALONE among the rest of his dis-

* Stillingfleet's Irenicum, part i. chap. i.

ciples he denominated with *peculiar honour*, his apostles."* They are also called "*the* TWELVE" in various parts of the New Testament: the "apostles *of Christ*," in opposition to apostles *of men*, or *of churches*, 1 Cor. i, 1: 2 Cor. i, 1: xi, 13, and in many other places. The term, when applied to others, is simply "apostle," or "the apostle," or "messenger of the churches."

The term apostle is also applied in the New Testament to several other individuals in a *more general*, and less dignified sense. It is, in this sense, applied to designate all who were *sent to preach the gospel:* the twelve apostles, and *all other preachers*. This is proved by the following passages:—Matt. xxiii, 34, compared with Luke xi, 49. For the apostles, as mentioned in Luke, are explained in Matthew by being called "wise men and scribes;" that is, *all teachers or preachers* of the gospel. So Dr. Hammond in Matt. xxiii, 34, "Prophets and others learned in your religion, which receiving the faith (Matt. xiii, 52) shall preach it to you;" and therefore, in Luke xi, 49, he translates the word "apostle" by the word "messenger;" and so Tremellius translates the Syriac there. Dr. Whitby, in Matt. xxiii, 34, explains "wise men and scribes," by "true interpreters of the law and the prophets," and instances Stephen the *deacon* as one of them. Thus Calvin, Mr. S. Clarke, and Dr. A. Clarke, interpret these passages to mean *all preachers of the gospel;* and, indeed, they do not seem capable of any other interpretation. In this sense, several of the fathers call the *seventy* disciples, sent forth by our Lord to preach the gospel, *apostles*. Apollos, who was nothing more than a lay preacher, is also in this sense called an "apostle:" compare 1 Cor. iv, 9 with v, 6: so is Barnabas, Acts xiv, 14; and see 2 Cor. xi, 13, with v, 15: Rom. xvi, 7: Rev. ii, 2.

The word apostle seems, also, to be applied in the New Testament in a more general sense still, to signify *any messenger* on public business, whether a preacher of the gospel or not. Though we notice this sense of the term apostle last, yet it is, in truth, the *most proper* sense of the word; and the former meanings only show particular applications of this general one. Thus Dr. Hammond on Luke vi, 13: "The name (apostle) hath no more in it"

* Euseb. E. H., lib. i, cap. 10.

than to "signify *messenger* on legate." "Among the Jews *all sorts of messengers* are called *apostles*. So Abijah (1 Kings xiv, 6) is called σκληρος Αποστολος, that is, a harsh apostle, or *messenger* of ill news. And in the Old Testament the word is *no otherwise* used. Among the Talmudists it is used of them that were, by the rulers of the synagogues, *sent out* to receive the tenths and dues that belonged to the synagogues. And, in like manner, the *messengers* of the church that carried their liberality, or letters congratulatory, from one to another, are by Ignatius called θεοδρομοι and θεοπρεσβυται, the *divine carriers*, or embassadors; and so in the *Theodosian Codex tit. de Judæis, apostoli*, are those that were *sent* by the patriarch at a set time to require the gold and silver due to them." Thus the persons who were *chosen by the churches* to *carry* the *money* collected in Greece for the poor brethren at Jerusalem are called the apostles: that is, as our translators justly render it, "the *messengers of the churches*," 2 Cor. viii, 23. This is explained by the apostle Paul himself, where he says, in 1 Cor. xvi, 3, "And when I come, *whomsoever ye shall approve* by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality to Jerusalem:" as in 2 Cor. viii, 19, he speaks of them as "*chosen of the churches* to travel with us in this grace," with this liberal contribution. The reader will observe that St. Paul does NOT number Titus with these apostles, or, more properly *messengers;* and for this plain reason, these messengers were persons chosen or *ordained by the churches* to this business, —Titus was NOT; but only sent in company with them by the apostle: they, therefore, were *messengers of the churches*, and THEY *only*, 2 Cor. viii, 23, "Whether any do inquire of Titus, *he* is MY *partner* and fellow-helper concerning you; or our *brethren* be inquired of, THEY are the MESSENGERS of the *churches*, and the glory of Christ." In Phil. ii, 25, it seems to be used again to mean a *public messenger*, a messenger of the church, sent on THEIR public business. Bishop Taylor here actually* perverts

* No man's name should shield him when he perverts the truth. This is not the only instance in which Bishop Taylor has been guilty of perverting the truth to serve a system. Quoting the annotation of Zonoras, p. 280, upon the twelfth canon of the Laodicean council, "*Populi suffragiis* olim episcopi eligebantur," he translates, "of old

the sense by a false translation. He renders συνεργος, my "*compeer*," in order to raise Epaphroditus, as a prototype of modern bishops, to equality with apostles. He would thus make Priscilla and Aquila (Rom. xvi, 3) apostolic compeers, τους συνεργους μου; and perhaps Priscilla would stand as a prototype for a race of *female* bishops! Will he also make apostles themselves compeers with God, because they were workers together with him, Θεου γαρ εσμεν συνεργοι? 1 Cor. iii, 9. The apostle's language, however, is distinct, as before:—"Yet I suppose it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, *my companion in labour*, συνεργον μου, but YOUR *messenger*, υμων δε αποστολον," Phil. ii, 25. Dodwell has the candour and good sense to see this. "If it were true," says he, "that these secondary apostles of the churches were the apostles of the churches for no other reason than this, that they were sent to *plant* churches, there would in this view be no ground on which they could be distinguished from the primary apostles; for the apostles of Christ were sent forth and appointed by Christ himself to this office of *planting* churches. Ephes. iv, 11–13. But we may easily gather from the Epistle to

time bishops were chosen NOT WITHOUT the suffrage of the people," instead of "BY the suffrage of the people;" and this is done evidently to *weaken* or *alter* the sense of the passage, as a proof of the people's power formerly in choosing the bishop "BY their suffrages." He tells his reader, at p. 55, that Jerome is dissuading Heliodorus from taking on him "the *great burden* of the EPISCOPAL OFFICE." Now Jerome commences his discourse on the subject by saying, "Provocabis ad CLEROS?"—"Do you now come to the CLERGY?" But then Jerome, in the next line, speaks of THESE CLERGY, without any distinction, as "SUCCEEDING *to the* APOSTOLICAL DEGREE." Here is the secret. So Jerome must be made to speak to Heliodorus about "the great burden of the *episcopal office!*" Again, in the very same page: "Feed the flock of God which is among you, said St. Peter to the BISHOPS of *Pontus*, *Galatia*, *Cappadocia*, *Asia*, and *Bithynia*. Similia enim SUCCESSORIBUS SUIS Petrus scripsit præcepta, saith Theodorus—St. Peter gave the same precepts to HIS SUCCESSORS which Christ gave to him," p. 55. Here he finds Theodoret speaking of APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSORS: so they must be made BISHOPS, though the sacred text expressly says they were "PRESBYTERS!" 1 Pet. v, 1–3. There is a very reprehensible attempt of the same kind upon the eighteenth canon of the council of Ancyra, at p. 176. The Church of England divines never spare the Popish divines when they detect them in such tricks: they boldly charge them with "forgeries and corruptions of councils and fathers." They do right. "Thou that judgest another, thou condemnest thyself," if thou doest any of the same things.

the Philippians to what the office of Epaphroditus, as an apostle or messenger, referred, (chap. iv, 18,) 'But I have all, and abound: I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things *which were sent* from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God.' *His office*, therefore, *belonged to* PECUNIARY *affairs*. *Rem igitur* pecuniariam *spectabat illa legatio*."* He treats this subject well to the end of the section; but we must study brevity.

Here, then, we see the word apostle, or apostles, signifies in the New Testament, first, "*the twelve* apostles," so designated by way of eminence, as distinguished from all others: secondly, it signifies, in a more general and less dignified sense, *all preachers of the gospel;* and, thirdly, it signifies *any public messenger*, as "the messenger of the churches," 2 Cor. viii, 23: Phil. ii, 23.

Here let the reader remark:

First, that the application of the name apostle to the bishops of modern times, in the *second* and *third* senses, will give them no prerogatives over any other ministers of the gospel: it must, then, be claimed for them by high Churchmen in the *first* sense, as applied to designate *the twelve* ALONE: this is their claim. Let this be strictly kept in mind, as these advocates often sophistically *shift* their *terms*.

Secondly, observe, that from the exclusive nature of the twelve apostles' office, none besides themselves could possibly possess it during their lives: consequently, *nothing* possessed by *any other ministers during the apostles' lives* belonged to this exclusive office. To see the truth of the former part of this sentence, suppose that any other ministers, during the lives of the twelve apostles, possessed what are called their prerogatives in common with them, (the solecism must be excused,) it is clear as the light that such things ceased to be the *prerogatives* of the twelve the moment they were possessed by others *in common* with them. This could not be succession, but possession in common. It follows, therefore, that from the *exclusive* nature of the twelve apostles' office, none besides themselves could possibly possess it during their lives; and, consequently, that nothing possessed by any

* Dodwelli Diss. Cyprian, No. 6, § 17.

other ministers, during the apostles' lives, belonged to these exclusive prerogatives.

Thirdly, then, it follows necessarily, that as Timothy, and Titus, and Epaphroditus, were NOT *of the twelve*, no argument can be deduced from any thing in their case in favour of the *apostleship* of modern *bishops*. Yet these advocates fill their volumes with *tirades* about Timothy, Titus, and Epaphroditus, as *prototypes* of modern bishops.

Fourthly. To retort their own argument about *names and things* upon themselves—it would signify nothing for the divine right of the prerogatives of bishops were they sometimes called *apostles* by *name*, for *all preachers* of the gospel were sometimes called by that name; they must prove the *things* apart from the name; that bishops, as apostles, have what *no other* preachers of the gospel have. This brings us to *things*, to the *prerogative* of the TWELVE apostles; the proud claim of this system.

What, then, were the *prerogatives* of *the twelve* apostles, EXCLUSIVELY possessed by them, as distinguished from all other gospel ministers whatever? They were the following:—

1. Immediate vocation, Gal. i, 1, "Paul, an apostle, (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead.")

The ordination of an apostle, in the strict sense of the word, was not only *immediately* by Christ himself, *without* any *imposition of hands*, but it was *complete* at *once*, without the individual having passed through any *other grades* or offices in the ministry preparatory to it. Now no bishop was ever appointed *immediately* by Christ himself: high Churchmen maintain *imposition of hands* as *necessary* to their ordination; and, what is perhaps most to the point in hand, no man, on the scheme of high Churchmen, can be made a bishop who has not *previously* received what they call the indelible character of the priesthood, in his ordination to the office of a *presbyter*. A bishop, who had never been a presbyter, is considered *incapable* of administering the sacraments, and of conferring orders.* How is it possible, then, that bishops should be *properly* apostles, when the *ordination* of the one so *essentially differs* from the other, both in the form and essence of the ordination,

* Field on the Church, p. 157, fol., 1628.

and in the qualifications of the individuals to be ordained? Scriptural bishops, we know, were ordained such at once, without passing through any preparatory grades in the ministry; but, then, the reason is plain, viz., that, in the Scriptures, bishops and presbyters were one and the same office.

2. Apostles were taught the gospel by IMMEDIATE *revelation:* Gal. i, "For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."

3. They were INFALLIBLE *teachers* of it to others: Gal. i, 8, 12, "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."

4. They had a *commission* of UNIVERSAL authority. 2 Cor. x, 13–16; xiii, 10; Rom. i, 14–16.

They had a universal commission of divine infallible authority, as to the *doctrine* of faith and morals. It is not clear that they had any *absolute* authority in any thing else. They ordained elders or presbyters: so did Barnabas: so did Timothy and Titus, who were *not* of the twelve; and so did presbyters, they ordained Timothy himself. But, when ministers had been ordained and appointed to any church, there is no decisive proof that the apostles *alone governed* those ministers. Dodwell remarks justly, that "their *chief* work was rather the *planting* of churches, than the *ruling* of churches."* Ignatius, the oracle of high Churchmen, says, "It is not lawful without the bishop, neither to baptize, nor to celebrate the holy communion. He that does any thing without his knowledge, ministers unto the devil." On the high Church scheme, the apostles, during their lives, were the only real bishops. Now did the apostles claim any such authority as this over every special act of other ministers? Never! The thing, indeed, was impossible. How could they be everywhere to appoint every baptism, and every minute detail of ministerial duty? But there is not only

* Dodwelli Diss. Cyprian., dissert. vi, sec. 17. "Illorum (Apostolorum) opera præcipua in *disseminandis* potius, quam *regendis*, Ecclesiis collocata est."

no proof that the apostles *alone* governed ministers as well as the church, but there is no direct proof to the contrary. The ministers of the seven churches were some of them remiss, and some wicked: who, then, takes authority to correct and judge them? The apostle John? No: he that walks in the midst of the golden candlesticks: he does it. To say that John might, but did not, would be to say that the Saviour should first have rebuked John for this remissness; yet nothing of the kind is found in the divine message, but every thing to the contrary. It may be asked, What cure is there for wicked ministers? We answer, The Scriptural method is, to teach the people to *forsake* them; and to leave them to the judgment of God. This as to the church catholic: of course, every particular church has the right to expel bad ministers, as well as bad men, from its communion.

5. Apostles had the power not only of working miracles, but also of COMMUNICATING *miraculous powers* to others. Acts viii, 14–19: xix, 6: 1 Tim. i, 6.

I believe there is nothing more than these five prerogatives that belong *exclusively* to the apostles: all other ministers *preached* and *baptized*. It is most certain that others, especially presbyters, *ordained* persons to the ministry. 1 Tim. iv, 14. Presbyters also ruled or GOVERNED the church, Acts xx, 28: 1 Tim. v, 17, "Let the elders (PRESBYTERS) that RULE well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine."

In *which*, then, and in *what* number of these prerogatives do modern bishops succeed the *twelve* apostles? Have they had *immediate* VOCATION, not of men, but by Jesus Christ? Are they taught the gospel by *immediate* revelation? These advocates dare not claim either of these prerogatives. Are they *infallible* teachers of others? No. Have they a commission of *universal* infallible authority, as to doctrines of faith and morals, in all churches? Have they *universal jurisdiction*, as bishops? This they know to be a contradiction to other parts of their scheme, viz., that there can be only one bishop in one diocess. Have they, then, the power of *communicating* the *miraculous* gifts of the Holy Ghost? The rite of confirmation is founded on the assumption of this, or it is founded on

nothing that was the prerogative of the twelve. The assumption confounds the advocates: to give it up, gives up their cause. The claim, therefore, of the *prerogatives* of the *twelve* apostles for modern bishops, by these high Church advocates, is utterly unsustained by the New Testament. *This decides the whole matter.* The claim is as baseless as it is bold. No names on earth ought to save it, for a moment, from the reprobation of the whole Christian church.

Thus much for SCRIPTURAL authority, both as to the name and the thing; and no other authority can decide the question. However, though ecclesiastical authority will be discussed at length in the subsequent sections, yet as it will give a unity and completeness to the present article, we shall here briefly clear the subject of *ecclesiastical* authority.

What ecclesiastical authority, then, is there for this claim of modern bishops, being, as apostles, REALLY such, and *exclusively* the successors of the apostles? Some readers may be surprised, when I say, that there is not a single Christian father who says so: not one. What! not Theodoret? No, not Theodoret! Hear him: he says, "Those who are now called bishops were (anciently) called apostles. But shortly after, the name of apostles was appropriated to such as were apostles indeed, αληθως Αποστολοι, TRULY apostles." Here, then, even Theodoret declares that bishops are not apostles TRULY: that is, they are TRULY, as to the prerogatives of the twelve, NOT *apostles at all!* What, then, is the meaning of his ambiguous expression, "Those who are now called bishops were anciently called apostles?" Well, in the first place, he guards his own statement by declaring that those now called bishops are *not* "TRULY apostles." What are they then? What you please, but *not* TRULY apostles. It is no matter to this argument what you call them. He says they were called bishops; and his language imports that they *then*, in *his time*, exercised authority having some *resemblance* to what those anciently and truly called apostles, exercised. This is speaking to a *fact*, and *not* to the *law* of the case. We grant the truth of the fact; but what does it prove? That they were really apostles? No: Theodoret himself positively *denies* that as *fact;*

and shows, that, even in his day, they were *believed* NOT to be *truly* apostles. And Ambrose, as cited by Amalarius, positively declares, that the ancient bishops were so far from thinking, with our moderns, that *apostle* was *truly* the *appropriate* denomination for bishops, that they thought it NOT DECENT to assume to themselves the name of apostles. Thus we find their own authorities destroy their scheme.

Never was there a more bold and baseless fabrication palmed upon the public than this, that apostle was the APPROPRIATE name for bishops. The authors of it catch at some ambiguous expressions in writers of the *fifth* century; but what evidence do they bring from the *Scriptures*, or the purest and earliest writers of the Christian church? The *Scriptures* give no evidence for it, but the contrary. In those authors whom high Churchmen quote with the greatest triumph, Ignatius, Tertullian, and Cyprian, all the evidence is against this position of apostle being the *appropriate* name for bishop. Everywhere their highest declamations are made for them under the name—*not* of apostles, but of bishops. What a humiliation to men of learning, to lend themselves to the propagation of such strange perversions of the facts of the early history of the church!

But does not Ambrose say, that bishops were, by ecclesiastical writers, called apostles at first? He does. But he does not say that bishops *exclusively* were called apostles. He knew better. "Many were called apostles *by way of imitation*,"* says Eusebius, an earlier and better authority on such subjects than Theodoret or Ambrose. So he calls "Thaddeus, one of the *seventy*," an apostle. The learned Valesius's note on the place is as follows:—"*Apostle* here is to be taken in a *large sense*. After the same manner every nation and *city* termed them *apostles*, from whom they first received the truth of the gospel. *This name* was not only given to the twelve, but ALL their DISCIPLES, COMPANIONS, and ASSISTANTS, were GENERALLY called APOSTLES." They all acted as *missionaries* in spreading the gospel. The word apostle means a missionary. See, then, the goodly company of Apostles! Indeed Suicer shows that WOMEN, as well as men, were

* Euseb. E. Hist., lib. i, c. 12.

sometimes called apostles by ecclesiastical writers; and that the emperor Constantine and Helen were both frequently called, by ecclesiastical writers, ισαποστολοι, *apostolic compeers.*"* So St. Augustine says, "that, *generally*," in his time, "it was applied to such as were introduced into the ministry." He divides apostles into *four* classes, and says the *third* sort who were called apostles in his day, were such as were *smuggled* into the priesthood by popular favour—"*favore vulgi in sacerdotium subrogati.*"† Jerome is plainer still. He makes the same division of apostles into *four* classes. In the first, he places Isaiah, the other prophets, and St. Paul: in the second, Joshua the son of Nun: the third he states to be, "When *any one* is ordained by the favour and request of men. As we now," says he, "see many, NOT according to the will of God, but by *bribing* the favour of the multitude, become *smuggled* into the priesthood."‡ Here it is plain from the testimony of these great men, earlier and better authorities than Theodoret, that, in their days, *any* priest, *all* priests, even the WORST of priests, or *presbyters*, were COMMONLY denominated *apostles*. Grotius shows, that the emperors Honorius and Arcadius, in their laws, called the Jewish presbyters, apostles.§ Tertullian expressly calls the *seventy* disciples, *apostles;*|| though Bishop Taylor declares that they were only presbyters. Chrysostom and Theophylact, also, are mentioned by Estius on 1 Cor. xv, 7, as applying the term apostle to the *seventy;* so also Erasmus and Calvin, on the same place.

Such is the result of *ecclesiastical* authority, as to the *appropriate* name of bishops. Bishops were *sometimes* called apostles; but *not* bishops *only*. "Many," says Eusebius, "were called apostles by way of *imitation*." This name was not only given, by ecclesiastical writers, to the twelve, but to the seventy disciples; and, says Valesius, to *all* the disciples, companions, and assistants of the apostles." Augustine and Jerome prove that it was *commonly* applied, in their day, to any priest, to all priests,

* Suiceri Thesau., i, 477, and 1459.
† August. Opp., tom. iv, App., p. 9, ed. Sugd., 1664.
‡ Hieronymi Comment. in Epist. ad Galat., lib. i, cap. i.
§ Grotii Annot. in Poli Syn., iv, 1, 280.
|| Tertull. adversus Marcion, lib. iv, cap. 24.

even to the worst of priests. However, the bishops of that day, knowing that it did NOT *truly* belong to them, thought it *not decent* to use it, and to be called apostles: they, therefore, laid it aside. Their modesty was commendable: in this our advocates do not choose to be their *successors*.

But, if the argument from the *name* fails them, what was the *fact* as to the *thing* itself? Do ecclesiastical writers say that bishops were, in fact, the successors to the *prerogatives* of the apostles? There is no doubt that they soon began to write in an inflated style about bishops. Their *opinions* are worth no more than their reasons for those opinions are worth: their opinions can decide nothing *without*, or *against*, the *Scriptures*. We have seen that, in fact, bishops possess no *Scriptural* claim to the *prerogatives* of the twelve apostles. But do *ecclesiastical* writers really say that bishops possessed these prerogatives? Do they say that bishops have *immediate inspiration* of what they teach? that they are *infallible?* that they have *unlimited* authority? or that they have the prerogative of *communicating* the *power to work miracles?* Speak, ye lofty succession men! Ye are silent! you dare not say that they do! I dare say that *they do not*. Prove me mistaken. Nay, so far from bishops being said to be the exclusive successors of the apostles in any thing, the greatest ranter in antiquity for bishops, viz., Ignatius, or rather the corrupter of his epistles, plainly says, that "presbyters preside in the place of the council of the apostles." "Be ye subject to your *presbyters as to the apostles* of Jesus Christ." "Let all reverence the *presbyters* as the sanhedrim of God, and AS the COLLEGE OF APOSTLES." "See that ye follow the *presbyters as the apostles.*"

Do ecclesiastical writers say, that anciently bishops *governed* the church as bishops now govern it? They say that the government of the church was in common, that is, *by the common council of the presbyters*, the first presbyter* being for distinction's sake, and for the sake of order,† called bishop. Even Ignatius calls this council of the presbyters "*the sanhedrim of God*—the council of the

* Ambrosii Com. in Ephes. iv.
† Hieronymi Com. in Tit., cap. i.

apostles—the college of the apostles."* And Cyprian, next to Ignatius as to high notions about bishops, declares that he did "nothing without the council of presbyters: that the mutual honour of each required him to act in this manner."† But do bishops now govern the church so? No such thing. At the conference, at Worcester House, about the king's (Charles II.) declaration, when ministers desired that the bishops should exercise their church power *with the counsel* and *consent of presbyters*, Bishop Cosins (one of the most learned bishops in the canons, councils, and fathers) presently replied, "If your majesty grants this, you will UNBISHOP *your bishops*."‡

Do the early fathers say that bishops had, by *divine right*, the *sole* power and authority of *ordaining* to the ministry? Never! Ignatius says, that presbyters were not even to baptize, nor do *any thing*, without the bishops. This no more proves that they could not ordain than they could not baptize. But the fathers give us the reason of this restriction upon presbyters, viz., that it was for the HONOUR *of the bishop*, for the peace of the church, and to prevent divisions: so say Tertullian, Jerome, and Augustine. All this proves their opinion of a *divine right* for *good order*, and *peace* in the church, and that such an arrangement was the best way of securing these ends; and it proves nothing more. All deduced from it besides is mere sophistry and chicanery. But the matter of ecclesiastical authority will be discussed more at large in the following sections.

The result, then, of this investigation of the *apostleship* of bishops, is, 1st. That the greatest champions of high Church episcopacy are *divided among themselves* upon it: 2d. That the scheme *necessarily concedes* that Scripture bishops and presbyters were *one* and the *same order*: 3d. That every *prerogative* which the twelve apostles had, as distinguished from Scripture presbyters, was *temporary* and *extraordinary*, and that bishops inherit none of them: 4th. That as to the *name* of apostle, as *appropriate* to the

* Ignat. Ep. ad Mag. et ad Trall.

† Cyprian Op. Ep. 6, ed. Pamel.

‡ Calamy's Abridgment of Baxter's Life and Times, vol. i, p. 171, Lond. 1702, 12mo.; and see decisive evidence on the same point in Abp. Usher's Reduction of Episcopacy.

twelve, the claim of bishops to it is absurd, as it could not be appropriate to the twelve, and yet common to others: 5th. That, as used in a *larger* sense, *all preachers* of the gospel had it alike, in the apostles' days; and after those days also. So that neither in the *name*, nor in the *thing*, is *one* single *prerogative* found, to which bishops have any exclusive claim. Presbyters, therefore, are as much apostles as bishops are; and, by the word of God, as the reformers declare, they are *one and the same office and order:* all distinctions between them are of *human* origin; and consequently have no more than human authority.

Finally, then, we conclude with Dodwell, that "the office of the apostles *perished* with the apostles: in which office there *never* was any *succession* to any of them, except to JUDAS the TRAITOR:"—with the learned Dr. Barrow, we conclude, "The apostolical office, as such, was *personall and temporary;* and therefore, according to its nature and designe, NOT *successive* or communicable to others in perpetuall descendence from them. It was, as such, in *all respects* EXTRAORDINARY, conferred in a speciall manner, designed for speciall purposes, discharged by speciall aids, endowed with speciall privileges, as was needfull for the propagation of Christianity, and founding of churches:"* with Whitaker, the celebrated Protestant champion, that "*Munus episcopi nihil est ad munus apostolicum*—that the *office* of a *bishop* has *nothing to do with the office* of an *apostle*." † And thus, being fortified by Protestant authorities, we concur with Bellarmine, the great Popish controversialist, that "*Episcopi nullam habent partem veræ apostolicæ auctoritas*—BISHOPS HAVE NO PART OF THE TRUE APOSTOLICAL AUTHORITY." ‡

The early bishops were, indeed, frequently called apostles by *ecclesiastical* writers, because they then were the chief in *preaching the gospel*, and converting the heathen to God. This is what our MISSIONARIES now do. They are the *modern apostles* of Christianity. Xavier, who never was a bishop, was the apostle of Japan. But when do

* Dr. Barrow on the Pope's Supremacy, Sup. iii, p. 113, ed. Lond., 1680, 4to.

† Whitaker, de Pontif., Quest. iii, cap. 3, 69, ut citatur in Alt. Damasc., p. 104.

‡ Bellarm. de Romano Pont., lib. iv, cap. 25.

our modern bishops undertake this labour? At the time of the Reformation, Latimer lashes them for their entire neglect of preaching. Stimulated by the zeal of other churches, a few persons have gone out from the Church of England as bishops among the heathen, as the bishop of Calcutta, &c. Let them have their due praise. The writer honours such men as the present bishop of Calcutta. However, they are not strictly apostolical bishops: they generally go where the laborious *missionary* has FIRST *laid* the FOUNDATION. There perhaps has not been *a single instance*, for the last thousand years, of a *bishop* deserving the title of *apostolical* bishop, by going to preach Christ where he was not named. Away, then, with all this parade about apostolical bishops!

§ 3.—*High Priesthood of Bishops.*

Another argument is attempted to be deduced from the HIGH PRIESTHOOD among the Jews. The very learned Henry Dodwell, in his "One Altar," lays great stress upon this argument. See also Bishop Beveridge, Cod. Can. Ecc. Prim. Vindicat., lib. ii, cap. 11, sec. 9. It is a matter of regret to find such excellent men, forced, by a false system, to such unsuitable arguments. They assume, as indisputable, that the high priest among the Jews was of a different order from that of the other priests. This is more easily asserted than proved. The Scriptures speak of the whole priesthood, including equally the high priest and all the other priests, as ONE *order*. Num. xviii, 1: Heb. vii, 11, 12, "And the Lord said unto Aaron, Thou and thy sons and thy father's house with thee shall bear the iniquity of the sanctuary; and thou and thy sons with thee shall bear the iniquity of *your* PRIESTHOOD."—"If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after THE ORDER of Aaron? For the PRIESTHOOD being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Bishop Beveridge himself asserts, that even "Aaron is never, *in the books of Moses*, styled any thing more than simply *the priest*. In these books, neither Aaron, nor Eleazar who succeeded

him in the high priest's office, is ever any otherwise denominated than by the term priest, as *common* with him and all the other priests. Nor, through the whole Pentateuch, except in two or three places where the *later* administration of the Jewish church is mentioned, is the title "HIGH" priest used; though the mention of his office in superintending the other priests is constantly occurring." * But still this title is not, in the Scriptures, given *exclusively* to one, the first or head priest; "for," says Godwyn, "when King David distributed the whole company of them into twenty-four ranks or courses, the chief of every rank was called *Summus Sacerdos* istius classis—the *chief priest* of that rank. Hence it is, that we read of *many* high priests assembled together, Mark xiv, 1." † That there was not any *essential* difference between the office of the high priest, usually so called, and the office of the other priests, is demonstrated from this, that in the case of the high priest's pollution, *another of the priests performed his office*, and was called *Sagan*, the high priest's vicar or deputy.‡ The question, indeed, is of no real importance to our argument; for the *Aaronical priesthood has ceased for ever;* and "the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a *change* of the *law*," Heb. vii, 12. Nevertheless, the assumption, so common with high Churchmen, that there were really *two incompatible orders* of priests under the law, is, I believe, as utterly false, as the reasoning from it to the subject of the Christian ministry is utterly irrelevant. The simple and true answer, however, to all they can draw from the high priest's office, is, that we have, as Christians, *one, and* ONLY ONE *High Priest*, the Lord Jesus Christ. To attempt more than this runs direct into the popedom. Indeed, this assumption of bishops being high priests is not the only case in which may be clearly seen the tendency of high Church principles to go direct into Popery. The whole system of high Church episcopacy is supported by arguments so similar to those used to support Popery, that the celebrated Treatise of Dr. Barrow against the Supremacy of the Pope might, in great part, by a change of persons, the bishops for the pope, be applied

* Codex Can. Ecc. Prim. Vind., &c., p. 316, ed. Lond., 1678, 4to.
† Godwyn's Moses and Aaron, b. i, c. 5.
‡ See Godwyn, as just quoted.

with equal effect to the destruction of the one as of the other. A few passages will be found in this Essay, extracted from that unanswerable work exemplifying the truth of this remark. When will Protestant bishops, and high-flying divines, lay aside these foolish, judaizing, Popish reasonings? The continental reformers spake strongly against these things; and they were afraid that the quantity of "empty and Popish ceremonies," as they termed them, left in the English Church, would degenerate into something of this kind. The Letters of Calvin, Martyr, and Zanchy show this. That sainted youth, King Edward VI., thus speaks on this point: "Moreover the PAPISTS say, that as under the old law there was a high priest, or archbishop, of the Jews, so there ought now to be a HEAD, or SUPREME minister, among the Christians. To which I answer, that the priesthood of Aaron and Moses represented the SUPREMACY of our *Saviour Christ*, and not the pope." See his Treatise against the Supremacy of the Pope. This, with other evidence to be adduced in the following parts of this Essay, will show that this succession scheme does not properly belong to the English Church, as established at the Reformation, but that it is a corruption of later date.

§4.—*The Case of Timothy and Titus pleaded to defend High Church Episcopacy.*

Again, the case of Timothy and Titus is brought forward to support this scheme. "As I *besought* thee *to abide* still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine," 1 Tim. i, 3. "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands," 2 Tim. i, 6. "For THIS CAUSE I *left* thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain ELDERS in every city, as I had appointed thee," Titus i, 5. These are the principal passages on which the stress is laid. From these passages an attempt is made to prove that Timothy and Titus were made bishops in the MODERN sense of these terms; the one, of Ephesus, and the other of Crete: that they had the government of ministers as well as of the

people; and that, as such, they had the *sole* power of *ordaining* other ministers. The reader must be struck with the shifting, *protean* character of this scheme. We have just seen an attempt to make modern bishops to be *properly apostles;* and the authorities they use say, "that those who are *now* called bishops, were called apostles, and that anciently bishops and presbyters were the SAME PERSONS:" that is, that modern bishops and ancient bishops are NOT the same. And Dr. Bentley is positive that their scheme makes modern bishops NOT "succeed the Scripture *bishops*, but the Scripture apostles;" and that presbyters, therefore, while the apostles lived, were Επισκοποι," bishops. But here, in the case of Timothy and Titus, we find the *ground is changed*, and an attempt is made to claim superiority for *modern* bishops from Timothy and Titus, as *ancient* bishops. The reason of this shifting character is plain enough—its ablest advocates find no foundation sufficient and firm beneath them. A sure sign of a weak cause!

In the first place, we may remark, that all the advocates for making modern bishops to be successors of the twelve apostles, and NOT of Scripture bishops, *must give up* all arguments from the case of Timothy and Titus, in favour of their scheme: see pages 37 and 45 of this Essay, where this point is more largely brought out. This silences Bishop Taylor, Dr. Hook, the Oxford Tract-men, and all such writers and their followers, as to Timothy and Titus.

Secondly, Whatever they were, their special duties, as above signified, cannot be brought in as an unalterable rule for a *standing* order of men, with the same powers and authority: (1.) Because there is no intimation of any such thing in the text: (2.) Because they had the *direct* or immediate *authority* of the *apostles* for what they did, which none others can plead: (3.) Because some steps might be necessary in places where a ministry had never existed among a newly-gathered people, which are not necessary after the establishment of a church and its ministry: (4.) However, the truth is, that Timothy and Titus did nothing, and were commanded to do nothing, but what a superintendent in the Lutheran church, a senior or moderator in the French church, &c., would have consistently performed in similar circumstances; and yet this

would be no proof that such a superintendent was, by divine right, possessed of powers and authority incompatible with the other presbyters of that church; for all these churches solemnly maintain *equality*, by divine right, among all gospel ministers. The following extract from the "London Cases," that is, discourses written by a number of bishops and divines of the Church of England *against Dissent*, will establish what I say. "Pass we next," says the writer, "to the *reformed* churches of Germany, which are *in effect* governed by bishops, whom they call *superintendents*. Their office is described in the Harmony of Confessions, p. 227, to *visit* parochial ministers, to *preside* in synods, to examine and *ordain* persons fit for the ministry, &c. And when in the Book of Policy (A. D. 1581) for the Kingdom of Scotland, the office of superintendents is described, it is in these words: Imprimis, the superintendent of Orkney his *diocess* shall be the Isles of Orkney, &c.

"The superintendent of Rosse, &c.

"The superintendent of Edenbrough, &c.

"The superintendent of Glascow, &c.

"In all ten superintendents for that kingdom.

"Then follows the *function* and *power* of the superintendent—He shall *plant* and *erect churches*, order, (that is, ORDAIN,) and appoint ministers, visit, &c."*

Now what did Timothy and Titus do more than these superintendents? Nothing. Yet in these churches, while such methods were adopted for peace and order, no lordly and exclusive claims, by divine right, were set up for one minister against another: no principle maintained declaring all ordinances vain, if other ministers than these superintendents had, by the consent of the church, ordained, &c.

But, thirdly, Timothy and Titus are never called *bishops* in the Scriptures. The subscriptions at the end of the Epistles are of *no authority;* but only mere human tradition. And even were it proved that they were called bishops, as the word was then used, it would not follow that they were bishops in the sense of our modern high Churchmen. It will be seen, as we proceed, that bishops

* London Cases, vol. i, Judgment of the Foreign Reformed Churches, &c., pp. 45, 46, 4to., 1690.

and presbyters, in the apostles' time, were identical. To prove their point, therefore, our succession men have not only to prove that they were called bishops, but they must also prove them, as bishops, to have had power, &c., INCOMPATIBLE *with presbyters*, as presbyters. Now, as to Timothy, he is called an evangelist: "But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the WORK of an EVANGELIST, make full proof of thy ministry," 2 Tim. iv, 5. The first evangelists, like the first apostles, had superior gifts, as is evident from Eph. iv, 11, and modern bishops can no more claim this office than any other minister. As to the argument from tradition, for their being bishops, we shall see what that is worth by and by.

Fourthly. Timothy had, most evidently, *presbyterian ordination;* and, therefore, according to such men, could be nothing more than a presbyter: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the *laying on* of the *hands* of the PRESBYTERY," 1 Tim. iv, 14. The episcopal succession divines strive hard to avoid this, and to give apostolical ordination, by pleading 2 Tim. i, 6, "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee, by the *putting on of my hands.*" To understand this passage, the reader should keep in mind that the conferring of the Holy Ghost, as to *miraculous powers*, belonged PECULIARLY to the apostles, *as a* PROOF of their *apostleship*. To see this, read attentively the following passages:—"Now when the *apostles*, which were at Jerusalem, heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them *Peter* and *John:* who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the *Holy Ghost;* for as yet he was fallen upon none of them, only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then *laid they their hands on them*, and *they received the Holy Ghost*. And when Simon SAW that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also THIS POWER, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost," Acts viii, 14–19. "And when *Paul* had *laid his hands* upon them, the *Holy Ghost* came on them; and THEY SPAKE with TONGUES, and prophesied," Acts xix, 6. Here it is evident, that the *gift* peculiarly attending the laying on of the apostle's hands,

was the gift of the Holy Ghost, in *miraculous* power. The apostle, therefore, laid his hands on Timothy, that he might be blessed with some of those *miraculous gifts*. This was a distinct matter from Timothy's ordination, which was performed by the laying on of the hands of the presbyters. This is the true interpretation of these passages. Timothy's ordination, therefore, was *properly* presbyterian.

But suppose we grant to these divines, that the *apostle joined* with the *presbytery* in Timothy's *ordination:* what then? O! it would be apostolical ordination! and bishops being *infolded* in the *apostles*, it would be *episcopal ordination:* ergo, Timothy was a bishop. If the argument were worth any thing, it would prove that he was ordained an apostle; but it has no foundation. The apostle Paul and Barnabas ordained presbyters in every city; but they are never said to have ordained bishops. I doubt not but high Churchmen think that it was very unfortunate that St. Paul was not as careful about episcopacy as they are. They would have taught him how to write better. He should have written, that Timothy was ordained a bishop by the *hands* of the *apostles*. But he wrote, by the *hands* of the PRESBYTERY. Sad stroke to high Churchmen! Now whatever hands might be employed, the *denomination* of a thing is always taken from that which was designed to be the *chief cause* or instrument in the act. This is a universal rule. The *hands* of the *presbytery* are spoken of by the Holy Spirit as the *chief* instrumental cause in Timothy's ordination; therefore the ordination of Timothy was *properly* a *presbyterian* ordination. Bishop Taylor thinks it is necessary for those who believe that this was presbyterian ordination, to prove that the *presbytery* was NOT a company of bishops.* What work such surmises make of sacred writ! As though the apostle said one thing and meant another. "The presbytery that imposed hands on Timothy, is, by *all antiquity*, expounded either of the *office*,† or of a *college* of *presbyters*,"

* Episcopacy Asserted, p. 191.

† Mr. Sinclair, in his "Vindication of the Episcopal or Apostolical Succession," at page 23, Lond., 12mo., 1839, ventures to assert, that "the learned Calvin affirms, that the word presbytery does *not*, in this passage, refer to any college or assembly of presbyters, as conferring the gift on Timothy; but to the gift itself, namely, the function of a

says he himself, in the very same page; and yet we are to prove that these were NOT *properly* presbyters, before we can prove that this was *properly a presbyterian ordination!* That they might be bishops, in a Scriptural sense, we all admit: because bishops and presbyters are, in the Scriptures, identical; but to contend that they might be *bishops*, in the *sense* in which these men *now* use the word, would reflect on the apostle in a manner one would not wish to describe. Yet so does bigotry blind the mind, that these eminent men make statements awfully disparaging to the very word of God itself. I charge them not with the *intention* of doing this; but I charge their arguments with the consequence. Let him clear them that can.

Fifthly, to argue, that because the apostle says he *besought* Timothy *to abide* at Ephesus, therefore it must mean he was bishop of that place, is so puerile as to be almost below notice. If he had *besought* Timothy to make a temporary *departure* from Ephesus, this would have implied something like a *residence* there. But to beseech a young man, who was *generally travelling* with the *apostle*, to *abide still* in some particular place, *for a special* purpose there named, "to charge some that they teach no other doctrine"—and not a word about his bishopric or residence being dropped, is all so void of proof of his being bishop of Ephesus, that able men must be driven to severe shifts before they take up with such arguments to support so important a cause. Accordingly, the learned Daille observes, "Who, without the assistance of an extra-

presbyter, which Timothy received." Now, first, this is partly true and partly false. In his Institutes he gives the above opinion, but in his notes on the place, he delivers a different judgment. Calvin's words, in his commentary on 1 Tim. iv, 14, are, "*Presbyterium*—qui hic collectivum nomen esse putant pro collegio Presbyterorum positum, recte sentiunt *meo judicio:* that is, they who understand the word presbytery, in this place, to be a collective noun, put to signify the *college of presbyters*, are, *in my judgment*, right in their interpretation."

Secondly, Mr. Sinclair's interpretation makes nonsense of the passage. It would make the apostle say, that the gift was conferred upon Timothy by the *laying on of the hands of the gift!!*

Thirdly, it grants, after all, that the function or office to which Timothy was ordained, was "the function of a presbyter."

So, in spite of fate, and of Mr. Sinclair too, Timothy's ordination was a presbyterian ordination, and Timothy was ordained, not to the function of a bishop, but to the function of a presbyter!

ordinary passion, could ever have divined a thing so fine and rare, or have imagined, that to beseech a man to abide in a city, implied the settling him the bishop of it, archbishop of the province, and primate of all the country? Without exaggerating, the cause of our hierarchial gentlemen must needs run very low, that they should be forced to have recourse to *such pitiful proof*. For my part," says he, "viewing things without passion, from the apostle's saying that he besought Timothy to abide at Ephesus, I shall rather conclude on the contrary, that he could *not* be the bishop of that place. For to what purpose is to *beseech* a bishop to *abide* in his *diocess?* Is not that *begging* a man to *abide* in a place where he is *bound to abide?* I should not," says he, "think it strange at all, that he should need to be *besought to go* FROM *thence*, if his service was elsewhere needful. But to *beseech* him to STAY in a place where he is *fixed by his charge*, and which he *could not quit* without offending God, and *failing in his duty:* to speak the truth, this is a request that is *not very obliging;* for it evidently presupposes that a man does not lay his duty much to heart, when he needs to be entreated to do it. But however 'tis as to that, it is very certain, that beseeching *a man to abide in a place*, does not signify the making him bishop of the place. If that had been the apostle's thought, without doubt he would have expressed it: he would have plainly settled Timothy bishop of Ephesus, and left him there to exercise that charge." Dodwell declares, that neither Timothy nor Titus was resident at all anywhere, but were "*itinerants*," and companions of the apostles in planting and settling churches.* And such seems really to have been the case.

Sixthly, in Paul's FINAL adieu to the *presbyters* of Ephesus, Acts xx, there also called *bishops*, there is *not a word* about Timothy either having been, or being designed to be, placed *as bishop* in that city.

The case of Titus is so similar to that of Timothy, that if Timothy's will not support this scheme, they can have no hope in that of Titus; and the above observations apply so sufficiently to both, that we shall not repeat them. There is not a single point in either of them, in

*See Dodwell De Nupero Schism., sec. 10: also a Discourse on Episcopacy, by Dr. John Edwards, chap. 9.

proof of the succession scheme, that would be depended upon by any persons who were not resolved, at all hazards, to say something to support a sinking cause. Perhaps we should not omit to notice, that the very Epistle to Titus *shows plainly* the IDENTITY of bishops and presbyters: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders [*presbyters*] in every city, as I had appointed thee:—For a *bishop* must be blameless," &c., Titus i, 5–7—phraseology this, which clearly shows that presbyter and bishop in St. Paul's thoughts and language were one and the same. This single passage is enough to silence forever all attempts to make Titus a prop for this doctrine of the order of bishops, by divine right, being superior to presbyters; for it evidently speaks of them as being one and the same office. The parallel place in 1 Tim. iii, 1–7, does, on all just principles of exposition, come under the same interpretation, and implies that the apostle taught both these distinguished men of God the same doctrine of the IDENTITY of bishops and presbyters; and, therefore, neither of them, in their *personal* HISTORY, can be quoted as proofs of the contrary opinion.

§ 5.—*The Angels of the Seven Churches.*

The only remaining argument, of which I am aware, is from the mention of the *angels* of the churches in the Revelation of St. John. This is thought to imply, that some one person had the power and authority of a *modern high Church bishop*, in each of the then Asiatic churches. This is the most like a case in point of any thing advanced in favour of this scheme. But, that it cannot be held as a good argument, the following remarks will show:—

1. It is a supreme rule of interpretation, that what is *obscure* must be interpreted by what is *clear*. Now it must *clearly* appear to an unbiased mind, from Acts xx, 17–20, that the church of *Ephesus* was governed by a NUMBER OF PRESBYTERS, identical with *bishops*. In this solemn charge, and final farewell of the apostle, while *reviewing* the PAST, and *looking into* the FUTURE, and giving, under the INSPIRATION of the Holy Ghost, the best advice for the *continual* welfare of the church, there is not a syllable

about placing one individual over the other ministers like a modern bishop, to govern the rest. "There is no one presbytery, of which the apostle took such a solemn care, as he did of this; and there is no doubt, if it had been the mind of God that a single person should be set over them, but the apostle would have mentioned it at this time. He tells them in his charge to them, that he 'shunned not to declare to them the whole counsel of God,' Acts xx, 27; and immediately adds, verse 28, that the Holy Ghost made them bishops of that flock: this, therefore, is part of the counsel of God, that the church (should) be governed by the elders in parity, (by the presbyters in common.) If the superiority of bishops had been any part of the *counsel of God*, the apostle would not have withheld it from the presbyters at Ephesus at this time. They that affirm that the government of this church was afterward changed, must bring as clear proof for it, as we do for this establishment."* These writers will have it that Timothy was sole bishop, as the angel of the church at Ephesus: had the excellent Timothy so fallen, as is described Rev. ii, 4, 5? This is hard to believe. But that what the apostle predicted, Acts xx, 29, had partly taken place, is not impossible, nor very improbable.

2. The book of Revelation is a deeply *mysterious* book. Several divines of note interpret the whole matter in a mystical sense, as a representation of any church or churches in a similar state to each case there described, to the end of the world. See Cocceius, the very learned Mede, Dr. H. More, and Forbesius, in Pool's Synopsis. Pool himself seems to think that many things confirm this interpretation. Among others are mentioned, from More and Mede, that there were many other churches more celebrated at that time than these seven mentioned, and which equally needed admonition and encouragements. These seven, therefore, are made the mystical representatives of the whole.†

3. The term angel is here most probably to be taken in a COLLECTIVE sense, as the term *beast* in the thirteenth chapter. A similar mode of speaking is not uncommon in

* James Owen's Tutamen Evangelicum, p. 101, 12mo. ed., 1677.

† See Calderwood's Altare Damascenum, p. 99, for illustration on this point.

the sacred Scriptures; for instance, by the two witnesses, Rev. xi, 3, nobody understands two precisely, but a *number* of witnesses; and the angel mentioned, Rev. xiv, 6, &c., having the everlasting gospel to preach, evidently means *all* the faithful ministers of God's word in general, as then going forth to preach the everlasting gospel with more than ordinary zeal and success. And compare Dan. viii, 3, 20, where a ram signifies the kings of Media and Persia. Again, in Daniel, chap. vii, the same idiom is used. The four beasts are four kings, ver. 17. The fourth beast is the fourth kingdom, ver. 27. Now this implied the Roman power. But this power, for some hundreds of years, was a republic, governed not by *one* person, but by a *number* of *senators*. Yet these are spoken of as *one beast—one king*. Every person has observed that the Revelation follows the idiom of the prophecy of Daniel. This is the case here in using the term angel, that is, messenger or minister, COLLECTIVELY for a number of ministers, as Daniel uses the term beast, or king, for a number of governors possessing equal power at the same time. And what further confirms this interpretation, is, that the angel of the church of Smyrna is addressed in the *plural*, chap. ii, 10; and the angel of the church of Thyatira likewise is addressed in the *plural*, ver. 24, "Unto the angel of the church of Thyatira write—unto YOU I say," &c. Durham well reasons, that as there were, undoubtedly, *many ministers* in each of these churches, they must be spoken of either under the similitude of the *candlesticks*, that is, the *people;* or under that of *stars*, that is, the *angels* or *ministers*. The first is absurd: it follows, therefore, that the angel, the star, of each church means the *ministers* of that church *collectively*. This I think is the true sense of the phrase.

Some modern commentators who decidedly believe the identity, as to order, of bishops and presbyters, still think that in the Revelation of St. John, the angel means that*

* Suppose the term angel to mean some one minister presiding over the other ministers. In the *first* place, this only proves the *fact;* but gives no *law* binding all churches to such presidency. And, secondly, the question remains, was this president a presbyter or bishop? Admitting the fact, for the sake of argument, the chief evidence of that time will prove that *this president* was a *presbyter*. Presbyters are said to ordain, but never bishops. 1 Tim. iv, 14. Apostles are called

presiding elder or presbyter, *afterward* called bishop, by way of eminence, as *primus inter pares*, the first among his *equals*. However, though this would not alter the state of the question at issue, I still think this opinion

presbyters, but never bishops: presbyters are said to join in council with the apostles, but never bishops. Acts xv. St. John, in this very book, frequently speaks of presbyters or elders, but he NEVER once mentions bishops. Justin Martyr and Tertullian speak of the presidents in the churches in their days as presbyters. So the judicious Hooker: "John beheld sitting about the throne of God in heaven four and twenty PRESBYTERS, the *one-half* FATHERS of the Old, the others, of the *New Jerusalem*. In which respect the *apostles* likewise *gave themselves* the same title, albeit that name were not proper, but common unto them with others. For *of presbyters*, some were *greater*, some *less* in power, and that by our Saviour's own appointment: the *greater*, they which received *fulness* of spiritual power: the *less*, they to whom less was granted. The *apostles'* peculiar charge was to publish the gospel of Christ to ALL *nations*, and to deliver them his ordinances received by *immediate revelation from himself*. WHICH PRE-EMINENCE EXCEPTED, to ALL other OFFICES and duties incident into their order, it was in them to ordain and consecrate whomsoever they thought meet, EVEN AS our Saviour did himself seventy others of his own disciples INFERIOR *presbyters*, whose commission to preach and baptize was the same which the apostles had." (*Ecc. Polity*, book v, sec. 77.) Dr. Rainolds, an illustrious defender of Protestantism, thus interprets the passage in his Conference with Hart: "Presbyters were constituted bishops by the Holy Ghost, that they might superintend and feed the flock; and that this might be more effectually accomplished by their united counsel and consent, they were accustomed to meet together in one company; and to elect one as president of the assembly and moderator of the proceedings: whom Christ, in the Revelation, denominates the angel of the church, and to whom he writes those things which he meant him to signify to the others. And this is the person whom the fathers *afterward* in the primitive church denominated the bishop."*

Now this is all perfectly consistent with the constitution of those Christian churches where no high Church episcopacy is found. The superintendents in the Lutheran church, and among the Wesleyan Methodists, have every whit as much authority as is here supposed: yet all this exists in fact and practice where all the ministers, by divine right, are equal. Many Protestant writers† grant that Peter had some sort of *primacy* among the apostles; and many of the fathers speak of the same: the Papists, therefore, argue that the pope, as Peter's successor, has universal *lordship* over all ministers and churches. Their argument is quite as well sustained from Scripture, as the argument of high Churchmen is for the lordship of bishops. Dr. Barrow grants that Peter might have such a primacy "as the primipilar centurion had in the Legion, or the prince of the senate had there, in the *Roman* state: at least, as among earls, baronets, &c., and others, *co-ordinate in degree*, yet one hath a *precedence* of the rest." ‡ Yet he maintains the

*Rainold's Conference, cap. iv, in Alt. Dam., p. 47.
† Barrow on the Supremacy, supp. ii, sec. v and vi, p. 104, 4to, ed. 1680.
‡ Barrow on the Supremacy, supp. ii, sec. v and vi, p. 49, 4to., ed. 1680.

extremely improbable, because the *whole drift* of the New Testament, as we shall soon see, gives a more *perfect equality* to the ordinary ministers of the church, than this hypothesis would require. It appears to me, therefore, extremely illogical, in a matter so plain, to infer the contrary from a *single* passage, in a *very obscure* and *mystical* book; and that, while the passage itself is fairly capable of an interpretation in perfect accordance with the rest of the New Testament, as is shown in the third observation. At any rate, no valid argument can be drawn from so disputable a passage in favour of modern episcopacy.

To conclude this section:—Then it appears that there is NO POSITIVE *evidence* from the sacred Scriptures for these high Church claims for *bishops* as *apostles*, with authority and powers, by *divine right*, superior to, and *incompatible* with *presbyters:* there is *nothing* about a *personal succession:* about the *ordination* of ministers, &c., belonging EXCLUSIVELY to such apostles, *by voluntary humility* called BISHOPS. There is nothing in our Lord's commission, not a word: the plea of being REALLY *apostles*, is unsupported by the New Testament, and is contradicted by the fathers themselves; and it is, moreover, arrogant, unsustained by their conduct, and consequently ridiculous: the case of Timothy and Titus fails to support them, and the epistles to both contradict their scheme: the angels of the Apocalypse also fail them: the whole system, as to SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITY, is built on a sandy foundation, and is buttressed up by *violent assumptions*, *strained* or *false analogies*, *forced interpretations*, and, ultimately, comes to be placed, *by concessions of their own*, *upon mere human and ecclesiastical authority*. This is its proper basis. In this view of the case, they have a perfect right, if they think it the best, to adopt it, to advocate, and to recommend it to others. We fully concede this right. This is the view the reformers of the English Church took, as we shall see in the sequel.

But, then, to claim a *divine right* for this system, and

power of the apostles was equal: their rights and authority, as apostles, the same. Hence, suppose such a primacy of one presbyter as president over the rest, and that such were the angels of the churches in the Revelation, yet the power of all the presbyters would, notwithstanding this, be equal: their rights and authority be the same.

for this EXCLUSIVELY of all others; and that so as to declare that *no ministry*, except ordained by these modern apostles, is valid: that ALL the *ordinances* of all the Protestant churches in Europe besides the Church of England are VAIN, and *without* the *promise* of Christ: this, we say, is such a piece of blind and bigoted arrogance, as to deserve severe exposure and rebuke. It is designed to promote a spirit of exclusiveness and intolerance: may such designs perish for ever! and may all ministers learn that they are brethren; and that all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, are ONE HOLY, CATHOLIC, AND APOSTOLICAL CHURCH, built, *not* upon the traditions of men, but upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.

SECTION IV.

THE GENERAL SPIRIT AND SCOPE OF THE GOSPEL OPPOSED TO THIS HIGH CHURCH SCHEME.

"TRUE it is," says the judicious Hooker, "concerning the word of God, whether it be by misconstruction of the sense, or by falsification of the words, wittingly to endevor that any thing may seem divine which is not, or any thing not seem which is, were plainly to abuse and even to falsifie divine evidence, which injurie offered but unto men is most worthily counted hanious. Which point I wish they did well observe, with whom nothing is more familiar than to plead in these causes, the law of God, the word of the Lord: who, notwithstanding when they come to alleage what word and what law they meant, their common ordinary practice is, to quote BY-SPEECHES in some historicall narration or other, and to *urge them* as if they were written in *most exact forme of law*. What is to add to the law of God if this bee not? When that which the word of God doth but deliver *historically*, we conster *without any warrant* as if it were *legally* meant, and so urge it further than wee can prove that it was intended, doe wee not *adde* to the *lawes* of God, and make

them in number seeme more than they are? It standeth us upon to be carefull in this case. For the sentence of God is heavy against them, that wittingly shall presume thus to use the Scripture."* These words of this celebrated defender of the Church of England exactly describe, and justly censure, the conduct of these high Church excommunicators. They pretend to plead "the law of God," or *divine authority*, for their scheme of excommunicating the other Protestant churches of Europe, while, "notwithstanding, when they come to allege what word and what law they meant, their *common ordinary* practice is, to quote BY-SPEECHES in some *historical narration* or other, and to *urge them* as if they were written in *most exact form of* LAW." So, if the subject of the alms of the church be *historically* treated, and the Greek term for messengers be used, (a term which was also applied to those extraordinary ministers, by it denominated apostles,) this is immediately caught at in order to create a second order of apostles, to whom modern bishops are to be the exclusive successors. Again, if St. Paul wishes Timothy to abide at Ephesus for a special purpose, named in the request, this must make him bishop of Ephesus. St. Luke says, in *historical narration*, (Acts xxi, 17, 18,) "And when we were come to Jerusalem, the brethren received us gladly, and the day following Paul went in with us unto James; and all the elders were present." Bishop Taylor makes this *by-speech*, or historical narration, formally the "second evidence of Scripture," that St. James was bishop of Jerusalem. "Why (went they in) unto James?" he asks, "why not rather into the presbytery, or college of elders, if James did not *eminere*, were not the ἡγουμενος, the præpositus, or *bishop* of them all?"†

* Ecclesiastical Polity, b. iii, sec. 5.

† Episcop. Ass., p. 71. And Mr. Sinclair, in his "Vindication of Episcopal or Apostolical Succession," makes a mighty parade of this nonsensical argument, pp. 24–27. But he destroys it utterly by betraying its foolishness in the two following particulars: 1. That by it an *apostle* is ELEVATED to be a BISHOP of a *single* city!! 2. That consistently with this, he actually has the hardihood and infatuation to make James, *as bishop* of Jerusalem, PRESIDE OVER THE APOSTLES themselves in the council at Jerusalem. Fine work! a bishop lording it over the apostles!! These absurdities are genuine results of the argument. He quotes, as historic evidence for it, an acknowledg-

To be sure, the weary travellers must go in somewhere; but does the simple fact of their calling at a certain brother's house, prove that he was a bishop of the place? Besides, how absurd to degrade an apostle into a bishop—a universal commission into a local one, to a single city! "As if the king should become mayor of London: as if the bishop of London should be vicar of Pancras!"* Well, let us read verses 7 and 8 of this very chapter: "And when we had finished our course from Tyre, we came to Ptolemais, and saluted the brethren, and abode with them one day. And the next day we that were of Paul's company departed, and came unto Cesarea; and we entered into the house of Philip, the evangelist, which was one of the seven, and abode with him." Here, then, we make Philip, the evangelist, who was one of the seven *deacons*, bishop of Cesarea. What solemn trifling is all this! Nothing is more calculated to destroy the authority of Scripture itself than this mode of interpretation. The champions of Popery excel in it. They may do it consistently, because they have supreme *authority* to make the Scriptures say what they please. They often labour to prove the *uncertainty* of the meaning of the Scriptures, in order to increase their priestly authority. Their people have bound themselves to believe them, by giving up the right of private judgment. Thus the monstrous errors of Popery are received, on what they call the authority of the *church*, (that is, the *dicta* of their *priests*,) as the truths of God's holy word. Such is the method of proof used by these high Church writers, quoting "by-speeches in some historical narration, and urging them as if they were written in most exact form of law," in order to prove the divine right of their scheme, and that to the exclusion of all from the pale of the Christian church who do not conform to it. "What is to add to the law of God, if this be not? When that which the word of God doth but deliver historically, we conster without any warrant as if it were legally meant, and so urge it further than we can prove that it was in-

interpolation of Ignatius; and the work of Hegisippus, which Dupin, a competent authority, declares is little better than a fable The rest of his authorities may be considered generally as retailers of this original fable and absurd statement.

* Barrow on the Pope's Supremacy, Supp. 4.

tended, do we not adde to the laws of God, and make them in number seeme more than they are? It standeth *us* upon to be careful in this case. For the sentence of God is heavy against them, that wittingly shall presume thus to use the Scripture." Such a procedure can supply no proofs: it leads to much perversion of the public mind; and is dangerous in its consequences to the authors themselves, and to the cause of religion in the world.

It is a point which the reader cannot too carefully mark, that the proof—proof clear, plain, and strong, lies upon these advocates to produce. In strictness, there NEEDS NONE *against* this scheme: if their proofs fail to support it, it FALLS OF ITSELF. Their proofs are such as the judicious Hooker has above described. They are, in truth, no proofs. The system, therefore, falls by its own weight. This is enough to a serious, reflecting mind. Where there is no law there is no transgression. Nay, more, the very countenancing of individuals in an attempt to "make that seeme divine which is not, were plainly to *abuse* and even to FALSIFY DIVINE EVIDENCE, which injury offered but unto men is most worthily counted hainous." Let every person, therefore, take care how he becomes a partaker in the proceedings of these men.

We shall, however, expose these high pretensions from the SCRIPTURES themselves. In this section we intend to point out some of those *simple* and *catholic* principles laid down by our Lord and his apostles in the New Testament, in contrast to the narrow, bigoted, exclusive, and intolerant character of this pseudo-succession scheme.

One CHARACTERISTIC of the New Covenant is, the putting aside of "carnal ordinances," and "the TRADITIONS of men;" and the placing of our holy religion upon the *simplest* and *broadest* basis: requiring nothing as ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL to it, but faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, working by love, purifying the heart, and fulfilling the law. Even baptism and the Lord's supper, though POSITIVELY OBLIGATORY where they can be had, are *not absolutely essential* to the possession of the blessings of the gospel. Abraham was justified BEFORE he was circumcised. Hear the apostle, in Rom. iv, 9–12, "Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for

righteousness. How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be NOT circumcised: that righteousness might be imputed unto them also; and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised." Cornelius was justified BEFORE he was baptized: Acts x, 44–47, "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Every one that believes the gospel is *bound* by its *positive authority* to be baptized, and to receive the Lord's supper; but the Scriptures never declare that any man shall be damned for the lack of either; but "he that believeth not shall be damned." A wilful, presumptuous neglect of these positive institutions, is inconsistent with Christian character; but if ignorance, the prejudices of education, or lack of opportunity, occasions any individual who believes in Christ, as above described, to be found without them, he may and will be saved. He that saith otherwise, let him learn what this meaneth, "I will have mercy," saith the Lord, "and not sacrifice," Matt. xii, 7. Even circumcision, the want of which was threatened from heaven with solemn *excision*, or cutting off from Israel, was relaxed when circumstances required it. See Joshua v, 2–9.

The same observation bears directly upon the ministers of the gospel. Under the Jewish dispensation, great ritual exactness was enjoined in setting them apart to the service of the altar. The priesthood was confined to one family. Denunciations of death were proclaimed against any who approached unto God contrary to his own positive injunctions. These things were all marvellously calculated to

point out in shadow the ONE *priesthood*, and ONE *offering of Christ*, showing it to be the *divine way* unto the Father, and EXCLUDING ALL OTHER WAYS. But, when He came, all the ritual of the Levitical priesthood, and all the offerings, as offerings for sins: all the denunciations as to the ministry, the confining of it by carnal ordinances to one family and to personal succession, FOR EVER PASSED AWAY. There is not a word of any of these things in the New Testament; but quite the contrary. With the exception of baptism and the Lord's supper, there is not a single rite or ceremony enjoined in the whole of the New Testament. As to offerings, as offerings for sin, they are put away for ever, by the sacrifice of Christ: thus testifies the Holy Ghost by the apostle in Heb. x, 11–14, "And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins; but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For *by one offering* he hath *perfected for ever* them that are sanctified." Hence the Popish priests, pretending in their masses to *offer the body and blood of Christ as an offering for sin*, DESTROY the PERFECTION of the ATONEMENT itself. They bring it down to that imperfection which belonged to the blood of bulls and of goats, on which the apostle thus argues, Heb. x, 1–4: "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshipers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." Popery awfully corrupts Christianity itself by striking at its very foundation. It TAKES AWAY CHRIST FROM CHRISTIANITY, and conducts us back to *Judaism*. This is done to lay the foundation for priestly tyranny, that the priests, keeping the offerings for sin, and the power of absolution, in their own hands, may bind the tortured conscience to their own will, and play the direst tyranny over the destinies of mankind. Accursed system!

The blood of a host of martyrs has been shed in testimony against it. May Protestants never become blind to its blasphemy and iniquity! As to the ministers of the gospel, our adorable Redeemer, and his servants the apostles, proceed upon the same principles as those applied to sacrifice and offerings for sin. As offerings for sin have ceased to be offered for ever, so there is *no priest* in the *gospel ministry*. Our Redeemer *never repeats his offering*. He appears as our High Priest, in the presence of God, to make intercession for us; but his act of *offering himself* for us is NEVER to be REPEATED. "After he had offered one sacrifice for sin, he FOR EVER SAT DOWN on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool; for by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," Heb. x, 12–14. *He is the* ONLY PRIEST *in the New Covenant. No gospel minister is a priest.** It is very remarkable, that in the constitution of the Christian ministry, and in the government of the Christian church, our Lord seems *studiously to have avoided* introducing any thing like the *priesthood of Aaron*, and the *Mosaic dispensation* and ritual. The conduct of Papists and high Churchmen is the very opposite of this. Their aim is to Judaize Christianity. Our Lord proceeded silently in many things, that the change might not become a stumbling to the Jews. But, while the priesthood of Aaron was left to perish, as being superseded by His priesthood who is a Priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life, the service of the Jewish synagogue was generally followed in modeling the ministry and government of the Christian church. See this abundantly proved and exemplified by the learned Vitringa, in his work on the ancient synagogue, "*De Synagoga Vetere.*" It may be enough to the purpose of

* "In truth, the word presbyter doth seem more fit, and in propriety of speech more agreeable than priest, with the drift of the whole gospel of Jesus Christ. The Holy Ghost, throughout the body of the New Testament, making so much mention of them, (presbyters,) doth not anywhere call them priests."—Hooker, Eccles. Polity, book v, sec. 78. The high Church bishops who revised the Prayer-book in the time of Charles II. are said to have substituted *priest* five or six times, where the reformers had simply used the word *minister*. The New Testament did not teach them this.

our present argument to remark, that no office or authority there was confined to personal succession, and that every presbyter, appointed or ordained to the government and service of the synagogue, had the power of ordaining others in his place, though the exercise of this power was, for the sake of order, regulated by rules formed by the synagogue itself. Thus speaks Maimonides, the most eminent of Jewish writers on such subjects: "In ancient times," (that is, the times before Hillel the elder, who died about ten years after the birth of Christ,) "every one who was ordained himself, ordained his scholars. But the wise men, in order to show particular reverence for Hillel the elder, made a rule that no one should be ordained without the permission of the president, neither should the president himself ordain any one without the presence of the father of the sanhedrim, nor the father without the presence of the president. But, as to other members of the sanhedrim, *any one might ordain*, (having obtained permission of the president,) by joining with himself two others; for ordination cannot regularly be performed except three join in the ordination."* In the apostles' days, all acts of importance and authority were done by gospel ministers (in conjunction with the apostles) under the denomination of elders, that is, presbyters, and seldom under the denomination of bishops. It may suffice to instance only one, viz., that of ORDAINING other ministers: this was done expressly by the assembly of presbyters, and not a word about bishops in the matter. 1 Tim. iv, 14. Now here is nothing in all these proceedings binding the church to an order of bishops as the SOLE *ordainers* of ministers, and governors of ministers and people, to be traced by an uninterrupted succession of episcopal ordinations, and without whose ordinations no ministry, nor ordinance, nor sacrament, has the promise of Christ to the end of the world! It may be Judaism, it may be Popery, but it is not Christianity.

But, further, we have directions of quite a different nature and character from this scheme of succession, laid down as to gospel ministers by our Lord and his apostles. These are *holiness of life*, the *call of God*, and *soundness of doctrine*.

* V. Selden De Syned., lib. ii, c. 7, p. 173, 4to. Amstel., 1679.

We say our Lord and his apostles require HOLINESS *of life* in a gospel minister. Our Lord's requisition is, that he must enter the fold by himself as the door. This principally refers to his entering the office of the ministry. Now, will the great Shepherd of souls himself open the door of the sheepfold to wolves, even though they have sheep's clothing? The supposition is monstrous, and can never enter the mind which is imbued with just views of Christianity. Again, the greater always includes the less. The office of a minister of Christ is a greater matter than that of a private member of Christ's mystical body. No wicked man is a true member of Christ's mystical body: no wicked man, therefore, is a true member of Christ. A true minister of Christ, then, always implies that the person is first a real Christian. No man is a gospel minister who is not. Even deacons, an inferior office, not belonging to the gospel ministry at all, in their Scriptural institution, are to be men "*full of faith and the Holy Ghost:*" how much more, then, ministers of the gospel! When Paul speaks of the ministry of reconciliation, they who have received it are such as have FIRST been *reconciled themselves*:—"And all things are of God, who hath *reconciled* US to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath *given to us* the *ministry* of reconciliation," 2 Cor. v. 18. Some of the verses of the following chapter are worthy of a place here: 2 Cor. vi, 3–7, "Giving no offence in any thing, that the ministry be not blamed; but in *all things approving ourselves* as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses. In stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, in fastings, by *pureness*, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the *armour of righteousness* on the right hand and on the left." But the matter is treated professedly in other places, as in Titus i, 5–9: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders [presbyters] in every city, as I had appointed thee; if any be BLAMELESS, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly. For a bishop MUST be *blameless*, as the steward of God: not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy

lucre; but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, SOBER, JUST, HOLY, *temperate:* holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able, by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers."

Again, every true minister of the gospel must have the *call of God.* This cannot be better expressed than in the language of the ordination service of the Church of England, which requires that every man coming to be ordained should be able solemnly to declare, that he trusts he is "*inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost* to take upon him this office" of a minister of the gospel. This is not to be confounded with the call of the church. It is distinct from it, and precedes it. It is, in the nature of things, the first matter in the special formation and designation of a minister. Without it no man ought to enter the ministry: God did not send him. This rule attended to, the church would have no unconverted ministers, as God calls none who are not first reconciled to God by the death of his Son. "And this," says the holy martyr, Bilney, "is the *root of all mischief in the church,* that they" (the ministers of the gospel as then generally found in the church) "are not sent inwardly of God. *Without this inward calling,* it helpeth nothing before God, to be a hundred times elect and consecrate by a thousand bulls, either by pope, king, or emperor." See his letter to Tonstal, bishop of London. The following, among other scriptures, prove this divine call: "Then saith he unto his disciples, The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few: pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that HE WILL SEND forth labourers into his harvest," Matt. ix, 37, 38.—"And the Lord said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom *his lord shall make ruler* over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season?" Luke xii, 42.—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber."—"I am the door," John x, verses 1 and 9.—"But unto every one of us is *given grace* according to the measure of the GIFT OF CHRIST. Wherefore he saith, When he ascendeth up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same

also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.) And HE GAVE some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Eph. iv, 7–13.

Soundness of DOCTRINE is absolutely required. The nature of the case might have led men to see this: but human nature is blind. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned," 1 Cor. ii, 14. However, the word of God is decisive upon the point. The Judaizing teachers, that had perverted the Galatians, did *not altogether reject* Christ; but by preaching the law of Moses, circumcision, &c., as NECESSARY to salvation, *they* SUBVERTED *the gospel;* for the *necessary consequence* was that *Christ* was *not a sufficient Saviour*. Hear the apostle, Gal. v, 1–4, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace." Now St. Paul treats this as preaching *another* gospel, chap. i, 6. He then solemnly declares, Gal. i, 8, 9, "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, *let him be accursed*. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, *let him be accursed*," that is EXCOMMUNICATED for false doctrine. The epistles of the apostles abound with passages *warning against teachers of false doctrines*. The apostles' conduct, and the conduct of our high Church divines, are a perfect contrast here. The apostles determine the *truth* of the *ministry* from the *truth* of their DOCTRINE, and never, in treating this point, drop a syllable about their *episcopal* ordination, or their being in the *succession:* our high Church divines determine the *truth*

of the *doctrine* from EPISCOPAL *ordinations* and *personal* SUCCESSION, at least so far as to deny that any can be true ministers, true teachers, without these, however holy their lives, Scriptural their doctrine, and successful their ministry; and declare that the ministry of all who have this episcopal ordination and personal succession is a valid ministry, and that all their ministerial acts have DIVINE AUTHORITY, though they personally be HERETICS, SIMONISTS, and the MOST WICKED of mankind!

But we have yet matter to adduce from the New Testament more fatal to this high Church scheme than all that has hitherto been brought forward. The New Testament REQUIRES us to FORSAKE all who pretend to be ministers of the word, but who are *plainly unholy*, and who teach DOCTRINES CONTRARY to the truth as it is in Jesus: so our Lord, Matt. vii, 15–20, "Beware of FALSE PROPHETS, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are RAVENING WOLVES. Ye shall KNOW them by their FRUITS. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither *can* a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore BY THEIR FRUITS ye shall know them." "False prophets," says Grotius, "not as to their *mission*, or calling, but as to their *false*, destructive *doctrine*." "Who are *false prophets*, but *false preachers?* Who are *false apostles*, except those who *preach an adulterated gospel?*" says Tertullian, De Præscript, c, 4. They had *sheep's clothing*, but inwardly were ravening *wolves*. The disciples of Christ were to judge of them, NOT *by ordination or succession*, but by their FRUITS. According to this rule they were to be on their guard against them: not to obey them, nor follow them. "Let them alone," that is, "LEAVE them," as the word often signifies: "they be blind leaders of the blind, and if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch," Matt. xv, 14. In John x, 5, he says of his sheep, that "a stranger will they NOT FOLLOW, but WILL FLEE FROM HIM; for they know not the voice of a stranger." This at once establishes the *right* and *duty* of FORSAKING *wicked* and *heretical* ministers. St. Paul speaks

of the false teachers, in the Corinthian churches, "as false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ," 2 Cor. xi, 13. He does not hesitate to pronounce such the "ministers of Satan." And what are the *proofs?* their *false ordination?* that they were not in the *succession?* Nay, the very reverse, for he speaks of them as being *formally* "the ministers of Christ," verse 23, But they "handled *the word of God deceitfully,*" chap. iv. verse 2: "*corrupted the word of God,*" chap ii, verse 17: "denied the resurrection," &c., 1 Cor. xv. In his Epistle to the Galatians, he declares that "such teachers are to be held *accursed* by us." "I would," says he, "that they were even CUT OFF which trouble you," chap. v, 12. So, when writing to Timothy, 1 Tim. vi, 3–5, "If any man TEACH otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, *even* the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the DOCTRINE which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from *such* WITHDRAW thyself." In the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, the description of *antichrist*, in the second chapter, shows that he would be found in the *temple of God*, that is, would be embodied in a *false ministry*. See Bishop Jewel on this epistle for abundant proof of this point. They are, therefore, warned against him, and are to stand fast, and hold the traditions which they had been taught by the apostle, whether by word or epistle, verse 15. He then says, "Now we COMMAND you, brethren, in the *name of our Lord Jesus Christ*, that ye WITHDRAW yourselves *from every brother that walketh disorderly*, and not after the tradition which he received from us." This may principally refer to private Christians. But then the argument applies with increased force to ministers, in proportion to their obligations to holiness and truth, and to the pernicious effects of their conduct when standing opposed to truth and godliness. Yet I am by no means satisfied that the apostle did not mean *directly* to refer to ministers as well as to private members. He certainly speaks of his *own conduct*, and that of his *fellow-labourers*, Silvanus and Timotheus, as being *particularly suited to bear on the case* he

wished to reprove; but it bore on that case *most directly as they were ministers:* therefore, it is probable, that it was to *some who were ministers* that he designed his observations to apply. Now *he solemnly commands*, in the *name of our Lord Jesus Christ*, that they WITHDRAW themselves from every such brother, from *every such* MINISTER, who *walked disorderly*, and not after the tradition received from the apostles. So in Romans xvi, 17, 18, "Now I beseech you, brethren, MARK them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the DOCTRINE which ye have learned; and AVOID them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ; but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." He tells the presbyters of Ephesus in Acts xx, 29, 30,—"For I know this, that after my departing shall *grievous* WOLVES enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." To suppose the *flock bound* by the *chief Shepherd to follow ravening wolves*, would be monstrous. Our Lord says his sheep "will NOT follow" them, but "will flee from them:" at once *declaring* and *justifying* the *fact*.

St. John says, First Epistle iv, 1, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." And how are we to try the spirits? He tells us elsewhere: not by *episcopal ordinations*, and *personal succession*, but by their DOCTRINE. This is the way antichrist is to be discovered. In his Second Epistle he is very express on the subject, 7–11, "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist. Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward. Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the DOCTRINE of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the DOCTRINE of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this DOCTRINE, receive him not into *your* house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." Jude's awful descriptions and warnings principally regarded wicked ministers. And nothing can be

plainer than that the design of his epistle is to lead all true Christians TO AVOID such *corrupters of the truth*. The seven churches in the Revelation have the same directions. The church of Ephesus is *commended* for trying those who *say* they are *apostles*, and are not. So the church of Pergamos has admonitions about the Balaamites and Nicolaitanes. Their leaders were evidently ministers or teachers, and were to be REJECTED at the peril of God's judgments: "Repent, or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against them with the sword of my mouth," Rev. ii, 16. The church at Thyatira is rebuked for "suffering that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a *prophetess*, to TEACH and seduce my servants to commit fornication," &c., verse 20. The same strain runs through the whole. Now everywhere *truth* of DOCTRINE, and HOLINESS of *life*, is the rule; and everywhere *teachers*, who are BAD MEN and PERVERTERS of the TRUTH, whatever might be their other pretensions, ARE TO BE FORSAKEN. To conclude these divine authorities: many of the Roman Catholics, before the Reformation, and the reformers generally, considered Rome to be the Babylon mentioned in the Revelation. This "Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth, who reigned over the kings of the earth," has always pretended to be *before all others* in *episcopal ordinations*, *personal succession*, &c. Yet what saith the Spirit to the churches? He that hath ears to hear, let him hear, Rev. xviii, 1–4, "And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and has become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies. And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, COME OUT OF HER, MY PEOPLE, *that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not* of her PLAGUES."

Here is surely enough to confound for ever such a scheme as we have seen exhibited by such men as Bishop

Taylor, Dr. Hicks, Dr. Hook, &c. The words of Dr. Barrow, as to the duty of rejecting the pope, apply admirably to this scheme, simply changing the person of the pope for this Popery of binding all Christianity absolutely to *episcopal ordinations* and *personal succession*. For whatever the popes have done, this succession hath done: the popes, as bishops of Rome, having always been the main pillars of the whole system. The SCHEME IS ONE, and its claims are one. The perfection of the whole depends upon the perfection of every part. It is a chain, forming, says Dr. Hook, an "UNBROKEN line from Peter—to the present day." Every body knows that the POPES form the MAIN LINKS in this chain. If you break the links of a chain, you break the chain itself. Barrow breaks the popes as links in this succession chain: he breaks, therefore, the chain itself. "If, then," says he, "the bishops of Rome," (*alias the ministers of this scheme, in any age,*) "instead of teaching Christian doctrine, do propagate errors contrary to it; if, instead of guiding into truth and godliness, they seduce into falsehood and impiety; if, instead of declaring and pressing the laws of God, they deliver precepts opposite, prejudicial, destructive of God's laws; if, instead of promoting genuine piety, they do (in some instances) violently oppose it; if, instead of maintaining true religion, they do pervert and corrupt it, by bold defalcations, by superstitious additions, by foul mixture and alloys; if they coin new creeds, articles of faith, new scriptures, new sacraments, new rules of life, obtruding them on the consciences of Christians; if they conform the doctrines of Christianity to the interests of their pomp and profit, making gain godliness; if they prescribe vain, profane, superstitious ways of worship, turning devotion into foppery and pageantry; if, instead of preserving order and peace, they foment discords and factions in the church, being a make-bait and incendiaries among Christians; if they claim exorbitant power, and exercise oppression and tyrannical dominion over their brethren—cursing and damning all that will not submit to their dictates and commands; if, instead of being shepherds, they be wolves, worrying and tearing the flock by cruel persecutions; they by such behaviour, *ipso facto, deprive themselves of authority and office: they become thence no guides nor pastors*

to any Christian: *there doth in such cases rest no obligation to hear or obey them;* but *rather to decline them, to reject and disclaim them.* This is the reason of the case. This the *Holy Scripture* doth prescribe: this is according to the primitive doctrine, tradition, and practice of the church."*

SECTION V.

SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCE AGAINST THESE CLAIMS, CONTINUED—BISHOPS AND PRESBYTERS THE SAME, PROVED FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT.

EVERY reader must see that ONE of the ESSENTIAL PILLARS of this high Church succession scheme is the opinion that the order of *bishops* is, by *divine right*, *superior* to that of *presbyters*, having powers and authority incompatible with presbyters, as presbyters: the SOLE power, indeed, of *ordaining* presbyters, and of *governing presbyters*, as well as the people. In this section we shall produce from the New Testament decisive evidence *against* this position, and shall prove the truth of the declaration of the English reformers, Cranmer, &c., that "presbyters and bishops, BY GOD'S LAW, are *one* and the *same*." As *preliminary*, we shall make three general observations:—

1. There is not in the whole book of God any solid proof that one STANDING order of God's ministers were ever appointed to have that power and authority over other ministers which these succession divines claim for modern bishops. The high priest among the Jews had the performance of some special duties of the sanctuary, typical of the Lord Jesus Christ; but there is no solid proof that he had, by divine right, this *sole* power over other priests. The proof is so far from it, as to ordination, that all the consecration or ordination he had, distinct from the other priests, was by the hands of these priests themselves. This is clear from the nature of the case; for as he could not succeed till his predecessor was dead, there could be none but common priests to consecrate or ordain him. Now presbyters are clearly as capable of consecrating bishops, as common priests were of consecrating the high

* Dr. Barrow on the Pope's Supremacy, supposition 7th.

priest. The apostles were *not a standing* order; but I think there is not very clear evidence that they had this *sole* power and authority. When churches were once planted, and ministers had been appointed, the apostles visited them to encourage them: they wrote epistles, by *immediate divine authority*, to *all the saints*, and sometimes, though seldom, they mention the ministers; but I think we find no declared authority SOLELY belonging to them as apostles, to call any ministers to account, or to depose them; and I am sure they *did not* claim the SOLE *right of ordaining*. See 1 Tim. iv, 14.

2. There NEVER was any *general council: never* any *number* of accredited *fathers: never* any *modern church*, since the time of our Lord and Saviour, who maintained that bishops were, by *divine right*, an order superior to, distinct from, and possessing powers and authority incompatible with presbyters, as presbyters. He that affirms there was, let him prove it.

3. If the sacred writers viewed this matter of the order of bishops, as *essentially* superior to that of presbyters, in the same light as our high Church divines do, we may expect to find them manifest equal, or rather *greater care and anxiety* to MARK *this distinction*, and lay down LAWS to guard the dignity, powers, and *authority* of that important *order* from all misapprehension and encroachment. This was done as to the Levitical priesthood, though belonging to a *far inferior* dispensation. But if we find the *sacred writers* speak of *bishops and presbyters* AS IDENTICAL, marking NO *distinctions*, leaving NO *laws* for the regulation of such distinctions, we may CERTAINLY CONCLUDE that the sacred writers had no such views on this point as our high Churchmen hold, but that *bishops* and *presbyters* are, by *divine right, identical*,—that they are one and the same order and office.

Let us now turn directly to the New Testament. HERE, and *here* ONLY, is the DIVINE RULE, as to the qualifications, ordination, duties, and powers of gospel ministers. Beyond this all is *human*, mere matter of opinion and prudential arrangement. And, while nothing is done contrary to the letter or the spirit of the New Testament, nor any human arrangement urged as a matter of faith, every church is at liberty to make such prudential arrangements as they may

deem most calculated for the glory of God, the conversion of sinners, and the edification of the church.

1. The word bishop, *επισκοπος*, is *never used* in the *New Testament* to signify the office of *oversight over* MINISTERS, but *only over* the FLOCK of Christ. The noun *επισκοπος*, episcopos, signifying bishop or overseer, is used only five times in the New Testament. In Acts xx, 28, it is distinctly said, that the Holy Ghost made the presbyters of Ephesus "overseers [bishops] *over the flock*." Again, in Phil. i, 1: "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Now here are only "bishops and deacons" mentioned. We have no mention of *deacons* in the New Testament as *pastors;* and the question is only about bishops and presbyters. Here are not any but the *people*, the flock, to oversee. Dr. Whitby says, that "the Greek and Latin fathers do with *one consent* declare that the apostle here calls their PRESBYTERS their BISHOPS." Of course, if they all say that presbyters are here meant by bishops, the high Church advocates of modern bishops will not wish to make it out that the oversight exercised by these presbyters was over *pastors*, because then it perhaps might follow that these presbyter-bishops had the oversight over some that were *simply bishops*. The next passage is, 1 Tim. iii, 1–5: "This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach: not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous: one that ruleth well his own house, having *his children* in subjection with all gravity; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the *church* of God?)" Now here is not a word about the oversight over pastors, but about "taking *care* of the *church* of God." When ministers and people are spoken of in this manner, the church of God *distinctly* means the *people*, "the flock." So, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the *flock* over the which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers, to feed the *church of God*, which he hath purchased with his own blood," Acts xx, 28. And it is evident the apostle means

the same thing in 1 Tim. iii, 1–5, for he compares "taking care of the church of God" to a man's "ruling well his *own house*, having HIS CHILDREN in *subjection*." Pastors are always *stewards or householders*, but NEVER the *children*, when the *relation* between the members of God's household is thus represented. The word επισκοπος occurs again in Titus i, 7: "For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God: not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre." This passage is the same in substance as the former, and must have the same interpretation. The last place in the New Testament where the word occurs, is 1 Pet. ii, 25: "For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls." Here it is applied to our adorable Redeemer; but it is *distinctly explained as referring* to him, not in the character of chief Pastor, as *superintending other pastors*, but as to his oversight over the *souls of the people*—"Bishop of YOUR SOULS." What can be a clearer proof, that the title of bishop, in the New Testament, was NOT given to designate an office principally distinguished in its superiority by its *oversight* over other pastors, than this, that the word is NEVER SO USED in the New Testament; but *always* and *only* to imply OVERSIGHT OVER THE FLOCK?

2. Bishops and presbyters in the New Testament have the NAMES COMMON, that is, bishops are called presbyters, and presbyters are called bishops, indifferently: therefore they are essentially one and the same. It is granted by Episcopalians, high and low, that the *names are common*. Dr. Hammond, in chapter sixth of his Fourth Dissertation against Blondel, admits this, as to the fathers in general, and quotes the words of Theodoret, that "they both had the names common." And Œcumenius, says he, following Chrysostom, declares the same. So Bishop Taylor says, "All men grant that (in Scripture) the *names are confounded*," sec. 32: and even Dr. Hook does not deny this. However, these writers deny the *conclusion*, that the names being thus common, the offices are essentially the same: we affirm it. We affirm it from the *usage* of the language of the New Testament. There is no instance, in the New Testament, of using the names of officers so in common, and of employing the terms indifferently,

the one for the other, without any marked distinction; and yet those offices remaining essentially different and incompatible. Apostles are *sometimes* called elders; but apostles are not called elders, and elders apostles, indifferently, and without distinction: they are mentioned *together* and *distinctly*, "apostles and elders," Acts xv, 6 and 23. Now this is never the case with bishops and presbyters: they are never thus distinguished. When either of the terms bishop or presbyter is used, the other is never used along with it: which proves they meant the same thing, as one always sufficed without the other. The same remarks apply to the word deacon. The general meaning of this word is *minister*. It is *sometimes*, therefore, used for an *apostle*, as an apostle was a minister of Christ. But then the distinction is plain enough in the New Testament; and for any one to say that apostles are called deacons, and deacons apostles, indifferently in the New Testament, would only be to expose himself to the contempt of every thinking person. The language of the New Testament, then, establishes the CONCLUSION, that, where the "names are common," the things are substantially the same. Besides, the contrary position is absurd, and implies a strange imputation upon the Scriptures themselves, viz., that they should use the "*names* in *common* and confound them," while the *things* were ESSENTIALLY *different*. This would be to say that the apostles, and the Holy Spirit that inspired them, were either *unable to distinguish* things by right names, or were *totally negligent* of such distinctions in matters of the highest importance: or, lastly, that they designed to mislead their readers under the *ambiguities of* language:* all of which are im-

* Mr. Sinclair (p. 10) actually declares that "we *cannot reasonably* look in the Holy Scriptures for any regular discussion or explicit statements" on these subjects: yet he and his brethren think *they* can "*reasonably*" excommunicate others for not receiving that for which they "cannot reasonably look" in the Scriptures. He pronounces it "*idle to expect*" these things in the writings of the New Testament. There is good reason with Mr. Sinclair and such writers for these statements: they know the New Testament fails to support their cause. He asserts (p. 14) that the "OFFICES of religion (of Christianity) COULD NOT at once possess appropriate designations." So the Holy Ghost really "*could not* give appropriate designations" to the officers of the church without the help of ecclesiastics!! Accordingly, he says, (p. 16,)

putations so monstrously absurd, not to say blasphemous, that no pious mind could maintain them, when seen, for a single moment. There is no such usage in any language, as that names should be common and confounded, where things are *essentially* different: the thing is impossible. The community of names, therefore, in the New Testament, between bishops and presbyters, implies a community of attributes, a substantial identity of nature; and that bishops and presbyters are not only *nominally*, but *really* and indeed, *one* and the *same* office. We will now give a few examples from the New Testament of this community of names. In Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, he thus addresses them, chap. i, 1: "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." "The Greek and Latin fathers," it is granted, "do with one consent declare that the apostle here calls their presbyters their bishops." In his Epistle to Titus, chap. i, 5–7, he speaks as follows: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders [PRESBYTERS] in every city, as I had appointed thee; if any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly. For a *bishop* must be blameless, as the steward of God: not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre." Here nothing can be clearer than that presbyters and bishops are spoken of as identical. To say, ordain elders, for a bishop must be blameless, is like saying, crown the sovereign, for the king must be crowned. In 1 Tim. iii, 1, 2, &c., the same subject is treated nearly in the same words. In Timothy, the term bishop only is used, it being indifferent which was employed, whether bishop or presbyter, as they both meant the same. Again, in Acts xx, 17 and 28— "And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the

"We must NOT *expect* words and phrases to be used with the same precision, on their first appropriation," in *the New Testament*, "to ecclesiastical things and persons, as we find them in LATER ages: when their peculiar and restricted meaning was ESTABLISHED, and when familiarity with their new interpretation had dissolved ANCIENT associations." Is not this saying that ecclesiastics, and not the Lord Jesus Christ, and his apostles, are to ESTABLISH the terms and LAWS OF OFFICE in Christianity? The pope and Church of Rome never demanded more.

elders [PRESBYTERS] of the church. And when they were come to him, he said unto them, Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, [bishops,] to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." In these passages the matter is so clear, that to add any remarks would be to insult the reader's understanding. St. Peter's language proves the same point. In his first epistle, chap. v, 1–3, he thus speaks: "The ELDERS which are among you I exhort, who am also an ELDER, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, (επισκοπουντες, ACTING THE BISHOPS,) not by constraint, but willingly: not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock."

So much for the NAMES: we now come to the THINGS.

3. Bishops and presbyters have the SAME QUALIFICATIONS. Titus i, 5–7: 1 Tim. iii, 1, 2, &c.: Acts xx, 17 and 28.

4. Bishops and presbyters have the SAME ORDINATION. Acts xx, 17 and 28: Titus i, 5–7.

5. Bishops and presbyters have the SAME DUTIES: proofs as before.

6. Bishops and presbyters have the *same power and authority*. In the above passages no distinction is made; neither is there any in the New Testament, at least in *favour of bishops*.

BUT,

7. *Presbyters* ONLY are *expressly* said to *ordain*. "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," 1 Tim. iv, 14.

8. The *apostles* sometimes call *themselves* presbyters, but *never* bishops.

The term επισκοπη, in a *quotation from the Old Testament*, is *once* (Acts i, 20) applied to the office of an apostle in the New Testament; and is translated "bishopric:" however, it is *never repeated*, in this use for the apostleship, in the *direct* language of the New Testament. This is remarkable. The apostles, therefore, are never called bishops in the New Testament; neither is their office ever

designated by any cognate or similar term in the *direct* language of the New Testament.

9. Presbyters are mentioned as joining the *apostles* in the COUNCIL at Jerusalem, but *no* express mention is made of *bishops*. Acts xv, 2, 4, 6, 22, 23.

10. The *collections* for the poor at Jerusalem are to be sent to the presbyters, and *no* mention of bishops. Acts xi, 30.

11. It is well known that each church, containing the congregation of a city and its suburbs, was, in the apostle's time, the whole diocess. It was never called diocess by the earliest Christian writers; the term *parish* was the usual appellation. Now *presbyters* are the *only* ministers expressly mentioned as having the oversight and government of the churches planted by Paul and Barnabas: Acts xiv, 23, "And when they had ordained them elders [presbyters] in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed."

If half so much could be said for the divine right of the superiority of bishops, as is found in Nos. 7–11, for the apparent superiority of presbyters over bishops, we should be accounted profane to doubt their eminence, dignity, powers, and authority. Here the presbyters are the *only* persons expressly mentioned as having the right and authority to *lay on hands* in ordination: what sacrilege, then, it would be said, to violate this divine order! The apostles are called presbyters; therefore presbyters are apostles, and the *only* successors to their power and authority. This is triumphantly proved, it would be argued in the same style, by the presbyters being the *only* ministers acting with the apostles in sacred *council* at Jerusalem. They *only* were intrusted with the *collections* sent by other churches to Jerusalem; therefore all the goods of the church are by divine right under their government. They were the only persons expressly said to be placed in each diocess by the apostles themselves: who, then, can doubt that, whatever other ministers might be added afterward, they must be inferior to these apostolically succeeding presbyters!

Any man who knows church history, and the history of bishops, councils, and successions, will know that *not a hundredth part* of their proceedings have half so much

apparent divine right as is shown in the above particulars for the superiority of presbyters over bishops. And yet we do not seriously maintain that any essential difference existed between them. However, all the difference certainly appears in favour of the divine right of the superiority of presbyters over bishops. They were all bishops; but a presbyter-bishop was superior in gravity and wisdom, and in the authority which these qualities gave to him over one who was simply a bishop.

Let the reader peruse again the statements of the succession divines, sec. i, and consider whether he finds a single point of that system established by *Scriptural* evidence. Not a word in the New Testament about bishops as a *superior* order to presbyters; about the *sole* power of *ordaining* ministers belonging to them; and about no ministry nor ordinances being valid but such as emanate from these "spiritual princes and vicegerents" of God and of Christ:—not a word will he find clearly in proof of these strange pretences.

The pretence, then, for bishops as an order superior to presbyters, has no ground in the New Testament: the CONTRARY is plainly made out in this section. Presbyters have, therefore, by DIVINE RIGHT, equally as much power to ORDAIN ministers, and to GOVERN the church, as bishops; nay, they have certainly more, for there is plain, Scriptural authority for their doing these things, but there is none *expressly* for bishops. ALL THE OTHER PROTESTANT CHURCHES IN EUROPE, besides the Church of England, have *ordination by presbyters*. Their ministers, therefore, and ordinances, are equally valid with those of the Church of England; *and more conformable to* EXPRESS *Scripture*. "*Whatsoever*," says Bishop Taylor, as the champion of high Church episcopacy, "was the regiment of the church in the *apostles' times*, that *must be perpetuall*, (not so as to have all that which was personall, and temporary, but so as to have NO OTHER,) for that, and that ONLY, is of *divine institution* which Christ committed to the apostles; and *if* the church be not NOW governed as THEN, we can show NO DIVINE AUTHORITY for our government, which we MUST contend to doe, and doe it too, or be call'd USURPERS." *

* Bishop Taylor's Episcopacy Asserted, p. 41.

SECTION VI.

THE SAME ARGUMENT CONTINUED — PRESBYTERS AND BISHOPS THE SAME: PROVED FROM THE PUREST CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY.

WE are now coming upon ground of NO ESSENTIAL importance to our cause. DIVINE RIGHT can ONLY be proved by DIVINE AUTHORITY: the *fathers* are *mere human* authority: they never expected to be received in any other light. Indeed no church, not even the Church of Rome, ever confined itself to the authority of the fathers any further than they found that authority favour their schemes and designs. Let any man read even Bishop Taylor's Liberty of Prophesying, sections 5–8, and he will be abundantly satisfied on this point. A short extract or two from him may suffice. "No CHURCH at this day admits the *one-half* of those things, which certainly by the fathers were called *traditions apostolical*," sec. 5. "And, therefore, it is *not* HONEST for either side to *press* the *authority of the fathers*, as a CONCLUDING argument in matters of dispute, unless themselves will be content to submit in all things to the testimony of an equal number of them, which I am certain neither side will do," sec. 8. One of the greatest of the fathers, St. Augustine, shall state this point, of the authority of fathers, councils, &c. To the Donatists he says, "You are *accustomed to object against us the letters of Cyprian*, the *judgment* of Cyprian, the *council* held under Cyprian. Now, who knows not that the *holy and canonical Scripture* is confined solely to the Old and New Testament; and in this it is distinguished from the writings of all succeeding bishops, that no doubt nor dispute whatever is to be had about the sacred Scriptures, as to the truth and right of anything contained in the same; but the *letters of bishops*, written after the confirmation of the sacred canon, may be *reprehended or corrected*, if in any thing they deviate from the truth, by the *wiser* writings of ANY ONE having in this matter *more knowledge* than they, or by the weightier authority and deeper prudence of other bishops or councils. And even *councils themselves*, held

in *particular* regions or provinces, yield, without question, to the authority of *fuller* councils, collected from the whole Christian world; and *these* fuller councils are *often corrected by succeeding* ones, when experience has brought something to the light which was before hid, and something which escaped has become known; and *all this* may, and *ought* to be done, without any sacrilegious presumption, any inflated arrogance, and with Christian charity."* This is worthy of St Augustine. The Scriptures are alone divine authority: all human writings and councils are fallible: their regulations are merely prudential. This the reformers maintained: this is the *true principle* of PROTESTANTISM.

However, we shall see whether the *boasting* of these writers, as to the *authority of the fathers*, in *favour of their scheme*, is not vain also. The best writers on this subject mostly confine the *purest Christian antiquity* to the FIRST THREE CENTURIES. Now I challenge any man to produce clear evidence of high Church episcopacy from the fathers of this period.

There is one very natural mistake into which the advocates of this opinion have fallen. It is this,—that whenever *bishops* are *mentioned distinctly from presbyters*, in ancient writers, they immediately suppose their point is proved. I say this, to them, is rather a natural mistake; for such men are so accustomed to use the terms bishops and presbyters, in *their own times*, for what *they* receive as, by DIVINE RIGHT, *two* distinct ORDERS, that they easily fall into the persuasion that the ancient writers meant the same as they mean. Bingham has quoted, though for a different purpose, a good observation from Cardinal Bona: "They *deserve very ill* of the sacred rites of the church, and of their venerable antiquity, who *measure all ancient customs* by the *practice* of the *present times*, and judge of the primitive discipline only by the rule and customs of the age they live in: being deceived by a false persuasion, that the practice of the church never differed in any point from the customs which they learned from their forefathers and teachers, and which they have been inured to from their tender years: whereas we ratain MANY WORDS in *common*

* Contra Donatistas, lib. ii, c. 3, pp. 32, 33, vol. vii, fol. ed., Lugduni, 1664.

with the *ancient* FATHERS, but in a *sense* AS DIFFERENT from THEIRS *as our times are* REMOTE *from the* FIRST AGES *after Christ.*"* Hence it is necessary to take care that we neither deceive ourselves, nor others, by a *misapplication of words.* Mr. Sinclair (p. 21) has a strange rule of criticism in these matters. Having translated the word ἡγουμενοι, in St. Clement, by "supreme rulers," he justifies his translation by saying, that in "LATER times it is among the ordinary designations of a bishop." A very convenient way this of making the fathers say what we say. To prevent mistakes in words, it will be proper to fix the meaning of the terms *ordo, gradus,* &c., *order* and *degree,* as used by the fathers.

1. *Order,* and *gradus* or *degree,* then, are by the fathers used PROMISCUOUSLY. "It is evident," says Bishop Taylor, "that in *antiquity, ordo* and *gradus* (*order* and *degree*) were used promiscuously." Bingham says, "St. Jerome *who will be allowed to speak the sense of the ancients,* makes no difference in these words, *ordo, gradus, officium,*" (*order, degree, and office.*†

2. By these words—*order, degree,* and *office*—the fathers only meant *distinct classes* of persons, *without implying any* DIVINE *authority* for the arrangement. It is not denied by these divines that there were OTHER *classes* of persons in the primitive church besides bishops and presbyters: THESE CLASSES are also called ORDERS, offices, or degrees, by the ancients. So, for instance, among clerical *ordinations,* "*ordinationibus* CLERICIS," Cyprian mentions his ordaining Aurelius to the DEGREE, "gradus," of a "READER."‡ So of Celerinus as to the same office; §—of Optatus to that of "SUBDEACON."‖ And Cornelius, bishop of Rome, in the third century, mentions "*subdeacons, clerks, exorcists, readers,* and *janitors.*"¶ Jerome, who, Bingham grants, will give us the sense of the ancients, mentions "QUINQUE *ecclesiæ* ORDINES, *episcopi, presbyteri, diaconi, fideles, catecumeni*" the FIVE ORDERS of the church, bishops, presbyters, DEACONS, the *faithful,* and *catechumens.*"** And there

* Bingham's Works, vol. i. Pref., p. 2, folio, London, 1726.
† Book 2, chap. i, p. 17.
‡ Epistola 33, ed. Pamel.
§ Ep. 34, p. 58.
‖ Ep. 24.
¶ Euseb. E. H. L. 6, c. 43.
** Hieronymi, Op., vol. v, fol. 41, ed. 1516: Basil.

is a long treatise in Jerome's Works, distinctly treating upon SEVEN ORDERS, "the fossarius, the doorkeeper, the reader, the subdeacon, the deacon, the priest or presbyter, and the bishop." He calls the fossarius the *first degree* or *order*, and the bishop the seventh; and everywhere uses *order* and *degree* as *synonymous*. Here, then, if the term order means a distinct superiority by divine right, there is divine right for the gravediggers, doorkeepers, readers, and subdeacons. If it does NOT imply *divine right* in four or five instances out of the seven, by what logic will it be made to signify *divine right* for the *order of bishops* as distinct from presbyters? And this very writer, whether Jerome or not, says, that "the *ordination of clergymen*, the *consecration of virgins*, the *dedication of altars or churches*, and the *preparation of the chrism*, were reserved to the bishop SOLELY for the purpose of giving him authority or honour, lest the discipline of the church, being separated among many, divisions should arise between the ministers, and should produce general scandal." And he goes on to show that *presbyters* are, by *divine right*, *the* SAME *as bishops*, and have from God power to perform ALL the duties of the church; yea, that in a *presbyter* is the HIGHEST POINT, and the WHOLE of the *ministry*—"*Ergo in presbytero* SUMMAM SACERDOTII *collocari*."* He advises, however, to submit to the arrangement, made for the honour of the bishop and the concord of the church, *only* it be *used* with *humility*, and *not* with *pride*.

Among the canons and decrees of the British and Anglo-Saxon churches, are found the canons of Elfric to Bishop Wulfin. Howell thinks they were both bishops. Fox, the martyrologist, says, "that Elfric is supposed by Capgrave, and William of Malmsbury, to have been archbishop of Canterbury about 996; and Wulfsinus, or Wulfin, to have been bishop of Scyrburne or Sherborn. Elfric's two Epistles, in the Saxon canons and constitutions, were given by Wulfstane, bishop of Worcester, as a great jewel to the church of Worcester."† In the tenth canon, Elfric numbers *seven degrees*, or *orders*, as follows:—1, ostiarius or doorkeeper: 2, reader: 3, exorcist: 4, acolyth: 5, subdeacon: 6, deacon: 7, presbyter." These are *all* the

* Vol. ii, fol. 54.

† Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. ii, p. 376, fol. ed. Lond., 1684.

orders he mentions in the church. He does not mention the *bishops* as either degree or order. But under the order of presbyter he says, "There is *no more difference* between the *mass-presbyter* and the *bishop* than this, that the bishop is *appointed* to confer *ordinations*, and to see to the execution of the laws of God: which, if every presbyter should do it, would be committed to too many. BOTH, indeed, are ONE and THE SAME ORDER, although the part of the bishop is the more honourable. *Ambo siquidem* UNUM EUNDEMQUE *tenent* ORDINEM *quamvis sit dignior illa pars episcopi.*"*

These passages sufficiently prove, and more might be produced, that the ancients, by the terms order, degree, or office, only meant *certain classifications* of persons in the church, *without* intending to imply *any* DIVINE AUTHORITY or law for these arrangements. The *use of these words alone*, then, as applied to *any distinction*, in their day, between *bishops and presbyters*, will *never prove more* than a human or ecclesiastical custom or arrangement. Nay, even the VERY FACT OF THIS PROMISCUOUS USE of these terms *proves* that the ancients really had *not* the opinion that the distinction between bishop and presbyters was by *divine right*, and that it was such as our high Church divines maintain; but, on the contrary, that it was by *ecclesiastical authority alone*. The *supposition is absurd*, that they should hold the *same* views as our divines, and yet, though the matter was constantly before them, *should* NEVER *say so*. They mention the *fact* of the distinction repeatedly, especially in the second and following centuries, BUT NEVER THE DIVINE RIGHT of bishops as an order with powers *incompatible* with presbyters.

In order to understand the fathers aright, as to this arrangement of bishops and presbyters, Jerome shall, first, according to Bingham, "*give us* THE SENSE *of the* ANCIENTS." In his note on Titus, chap. i, he speaks at large and unequivocally, as follows:—"Presbyters and bishops," says he, "*were* FORMERLY *the* SAME. And before the devil incited men to make divisions in religion, and one was led to say, 'I am of Paul, and I of Apollos,' *churches* were GOVERNED by the COMMON COUNCIL of the PRESBYTERS. But *afterward*, when every one in baptizing rather made

* Canones, &c., a Laur. Howel, A. M., pp. 66, 67, fol. Londini, 1708.

proselytes to himself than to Christ, it was everywhere decreed that one person, elected from the rest of the presbyters in each church, should be placed over the others, that, the chief care of the church devolving upon him, the seeds of division might be taken away. Should any one suppose this opinion, viz., that bishops and presbyters are the same, and that one is the denomination of age, and the other of office, is not determined by the Scriptures, but is only a private opinion, let him read over again the apostle's words to the Philippians, saying, 'Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ which are at Philippi, with the *bishops* and *deacons:* grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.' Philippi is one of the cities of Macedonia; and certainly as to those who are *now* esteemed *bishops*, *not more* than ONE *at a time* can be in ONE and the *same city*.* But because bishops at *that time* were called the *same as presbyters*, therefore the apostle speaks of BISHOPS indifferently *as being the same* as presbyters. And here it should be *carefully observed* how the apostle, sending for the presbyters," in the plural, "of the SINGLE *city* of EPHESUS ONLY, afterward *calls* the SAME PERSONS *bishops*, Acts xx, 17, 28. He who receives the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, there finds the care of the church *divided* EQUALLY *among* MANY: 'Obey *them* that have the *rule* over you, and submit yourselves; for *they* watch for your souls, as they that must give account: that *they* may do it with joy, and not with grief; for that is unprofitable for you.' And Peter, who received his name from the firmness of his faith, says, in his epistle, 'The PRESBYTERS who are among you, I exhort, who am also a presbyter, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock of God which is among you, *taking the oversight* thereof, (*επισκοποῦντες*, that is, superintending it,) not by constraint, but willingly.' These passages we have brought

* The reader should keep this remark before his mind in the examples that follow. They not only show that bishops and presbyters are spoken of promiscuously as being of the same order; but they also show an *irreconcilable difference* between Scriptural bishops and ecclesiastical bishops: of *Scriptural bishops* there were frequently, perhaps always, MANY in *one* and the SAME city: of *ecclesiastical bishops* there cannot be *more* than ONE.

forward to show, that, with the ancients, PRESBYTERS were *the* SAME *as* BISHOPS. But, that the roots of dissension might be plucked up, a USAGE GRADUALLY took place that the chief care should devolve upon one. Therefore, as the presbyters know that it is by the CUSTOM *of the church* (*ecclesiæ consuetudine*) that they are to be subject to him who is placed over them; so *let the bishops know* that *they* are ABOVE *presbyters* rather *by* CUSTOM than by divine appointment, and that the CHURCH OUGHT to be RULED *in* COMMON." His celebrated Epistle to Evagrius treats on the same subject through the whole of it. He delivers the same sentiments in several other places of his Works. Still he continues to give the bishops all those titles of respect which Bingham and others have mistaken, or misinterpreted, for marks of a distinct and superior order by divine right. Jerome gave them "for the *honour* of the *church*," and because they had obtained, as St. Augustine saith, "by the *custom* of the church;" and, while no evil use was made of them, he was justified in so doing.

Now it is very important to keep in mind that this is the judgment and testimony of the MOST LEARNED of the *Latin fathers*. Bingham, a high authority with Churchmen, and a truly learned and candid writer, says, as we have seen, that "*St. Jerome will be* ALLOWED *to speak the* SENSE *of the ancients*." Jerome was consulted upon the highest matters of the church, even by the bishop of Rome. St. Augustine declares himself inferior to Jerome; and says, "*Nemo hominum scivit quod Hieronymus ignoravit*—Jerome knew every thing known by man." Jerome's testimony on this subject, as quoted above, was referred to frequently in succeeding ages of the church. It was, in the twelfth century, introduced into the *canon law*. The *reformers* repeatedly referred to it. And this they all did with *approbation*. It NEVER was *controverted*, *denied*, nor *disputed*, that I am aware of, by any writers of weight, nor any authority in the Christian church, until the sixteenth century; and then only by a part of the Romish writers, and afterward by the high Church of England divines.

Then let us trace and confirm each of Jerome's positions from the early fathers. He says,—

First, that "*presbyters and bishops* were the SAME in the *apostles' times.*"

Secondly, that "olim," formerly, "the church was *ruled* by the *common* council of the *presbyters.*"

Thirdly, that "to prevent divisions or schisms, *a usage gradually* took place, that the chief care should devolve upon one." The person who had this chief care was elected from the rest of the presbyters, and placed over them as a superintendent. Ambrose calls him "*inter presbyteros primus,*" (comment in 1 Tim. iii,) or "*primus presbyter,*" (comment in Ephes. iv,) the *chief presbyter:* by CUSTOM, *a superintendent* of ministers and people, called for the sake of distinction a bishop.

On this point of SUPERINTENDENCY, it is necessary also to be clear. *High Churchmen evidently misunderstood the fathers upon it.* Indeed, here is the GRAND SOPHISM, designed, or undesigned, that runs through *all their writings*, on the subject of episcopacy, *jure divino.* The *facts* of superintendency by bishops, mentioned by the fathers, are, with these writers, received as PROOFS *of divine right and law.* Every mention of the *fact* of a bishop's superintendency, is, with them, *a proof* of episcopacy as a superior order, *jure divino.* This process is quick, and, to them, conclusive. But it is really full of fallacy. Even had the fathers maintained it, their authority would have decided nothing against the testimony of the Scripture; but they do not. Two of the greatest of the fathers, Jerome and Augustine, expressly interpret the term bishop by "superintendent." This superintendency, Jerome tells us, only came in by CUSTOM, and *not by divine appointment;* so says Augustine also, that "a bishop was above a presbyter by the names of honour which had obtained by the CUSTOM of the church."* Now, that *superintendency*, as a HUMAN arrangement, is *perfectly consistent* with EQUALITY of DIVINE RIGHT between him who superintends and those who are superintended, is plain from the *fact* of its *positive existence*, on a large scale in the *present Christian church.* The Lutheran church has the arrangement for one minister to be placed over other ministers as their superintendent. And these are regularly called bishops and archbishops in Sweden and Den-

*August. Opp., vol. ii, p. 16, fol. ed., Lugd., 1664.

mark. The ancient Scotch kirk had the same church officers. The Wesleyan Methodists have the same arrangement. Their chief superintendents, in America, are actually and regularly called *bishops*. And yet, in all these churches, all ministers are acknowledged equal by divine right. A *bishop*, then, in the *primitive church*, was *a superintendent*. This is expressly said, (by one acknowledged to be qualified to give *the sense of the ancients*,) to be only *a human arrangement*, A CUSTOM; and that, by *divine right*, both the superintendent and the ministers whom he superintended, were *equal*. *When the* FATHERS, therefore, mention the acts of a *bishop*, in SUPERINTENDING others, this simply, and of itself, *proves* NOTHING, as to the *divine right* of bishops, as a distinct *order*, but only the *fact* of such superintendency. We now proceed to the fathers.

CLEMENS ROMANUS is the *earliest* writer we have after the apostles' days. Dr. Cave places him An. Dom. 70; but Eusebius places the commencement of his *bishopric*, as it is called, A. D. 92. His Epistle to the Corinthian church is esteemed one of the most precious remains of antiquity. He never mentions *together* more orders than two, presbyters and deacons, or bishops and deacons: thus exactly following the style of the New Testament, using the names bishop and presbyter as *synonymous*, both meaning the same order of men. He says the apostles, "preaching through countries and cities, appointed the first fruits of their conversion to be *bishops and deacons* over such as should afterward believe, having first proved them by the Spirit. Nor was this any thing new: seeing that long before it was written concerning bishops and deacons; for thus saith the Scripture, in a certain place, I will appoint their *overseers* (bishops) in righteousness, and their *ministers* (deacons) in faith. Our *apostle knew* by our Lord Jesus Christ that there *should be* CONTENTIONS arise upon the account of *episcopacy*. And, therefore, *having a perfect knowledge of this they appointed* persons, as we have before said, and then GAVE DIRECTIONS,* HOW,

* I have generally followed Archbishop Wake's translation. But I think the last sentence is not properly rendered. It should be,—"Our apostles knew, by our Lord Jesus Christ, that there would be contention about the name of episcopacy; and, therefore, being endued with

when they should die, other chosen men should SUCCEED in their ministry." Here, then, is a fair opportunity for treating this subject. There was a "sedition" in the Corinthian church, which, he says, was "against its PRESBYTERS," sec. 47. Clement says, all this was *perfectly foreseen* and *provided for;* and he tells us *how*. Well, *how* was it provided for? To be sure, by appointing an *order of bishops* over these presbyters and over the people, with the SOLE right, authority, and power of *ordaining* ministers, performing confirmations, and of governing both ministers and people. How different is the fact! Clement *never mentions* bishops and presbyters as *distinct orders*, but speaks of them as *one* and the *same*. "Bishops, with St. Clement," says Lord Barrington, "are always the same with elders or presbyters, as any one must see

a perfect foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid officers, viz., bishops and deacons, and gave *regulations* for these *offices* separately and mutually, that so when they died, other PROVED men might succeed to their ministry."

The difference between this translation and the translation of episcopal divines, is, that these divines make the "regulations" belong to the *succession;* but the above translation makes it belong to the *offices* of bishop and deacon. Archbishop Usher translates "*ordinem:*" Dr. Hammond, "seriem successionis, catalogum:" Archbishop Wake, as in the text.

The learning and talent of such men deserve profound respect. The power and influence, however, of a favourite theory are wonderful, even over the greatest minds. Had not this been before these great men, they would have seen, in a moment, that if Clement had meant "*catalogus*," a catalogue, he would have written καταλογος; if, "*series successionis*," διαδοχη; if, *ordo*, ταξις. Επινομη either comes from επι and νεμω, to distribute, divide, &c.; or from επι and νομος, a *law* or regulation. In the first case, it would most properly mean "a distribution or division" of the offices of bishops and deacons: see this done, as he says, by St. Paul, in 1 Tim. iii. throughout. In the second derivation, it would mean "a law or regulation" of these offices. Μεταξυ, means "among, or mutually among one another." His expression μεταξυ επινομη, therefore, following immediately upon his mention of bishops and deacons, evidently implies "a law or regulation of these *offices* separately and mutually." It may be doubted whether it *ever* means a catalogue, succession, or order of men. This proper rendering of the passage takes away all ground for the supposition that St. Clement meant to say that the apostles left *lists of persons* for the *succession;* and shows that the regulations he mentions, referred to the *worthiness* of the persons to be ordained. Now this is in perfect accordance with the regulations given by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus; and it is to these that Clement most probably refers: the other is unworthy of St. Paul and Clement, and only tends to support a bad scheme.

if they read the epistle."* Of course he *never* mentions a *syllable* about the prerogatives of bishops in *ordination*, *confirmation*, &c.; never a syllable about their governing ministers as well as people. Clement knew no difference between a bishop and a presbyter. He uses the names as different denominations of the same office.

We have heard what he says of bishops. Hear him as to *presbyters*. "Ye walked according to the laws of God, being subject to those who had the RULE OVER you; and giving the HONOUR that was fitting to such as were PRESBYTERS among you," sec. 1. "Only let the flock of Christ be in peace with the PRESBYTERS *that* are SET OVER IT," sec. 54. Here presbyters are set OVER the flock, and RULE them; and are most evidently the same persons as those before called bishops. The occasion of his writing arose from the disorders in the church at Corinth, by the opposition of some factious members against their regular ministers. In speaking of this faction or sedition, he speaks of it "against the PRESBYTERS," sec. 47. In the conclusion, he exhorts to *subjection* unto their *presbyters*," sec. 57. Nay, he speaks of the happiness of those "*presbyters*" who had finished their duties in their "*episcopacy*" before those times of sedition had come on, sec, 44. How could he have said *more plainly* that presbyters and bishops are one and the same, than by saying that *presbyters exercised episcopacy*, the very episcopacy which, he says, was meant by the Scriptures?—yea, the very episcopacy, of which he declares the apostles left directions how approved men should succeed one another in that office? In those early days, a church, a city, a parish, and diocess, were, as to extent, all one and the same thing. Now, according to *modern episcopacy*, there *cannot* be *more* than *one bishop* in *one* city, or diocess, at the *same* time. But Clement *always* speaks of the ministers of the *single* city of Corinth, whether called bishops or presbyters, in the PLURAL number: that is, as MANY BISHOPS in the ONE church at the SAME TIME. He never mentions such a thing as a *bishop* in the *singular* number. It is evident he knew nothing of modern episcopacy; nor even of one presbyter acting as chief presbyter in superintending other presbyters. It was then exactly as Jerome says, "*presby-*

* Miscellanea Sacra, vol. ii, p. 154, ed. 1770.

ters ruled the church in common." The establishment of a superintendency, by one presbyter elected by the other presbyters to preside over themselves, took place "*afterward.*" Thus, then, this *most ancient* of all the primitive writers, coeval with the apostle John, shows us that, in his day, the terms bishop and presbyter were only different names for the *same office;* and that bishops and presbyters were *one* and the *same order* of ministers.

Ignatius comes next. Dr. Cave places him A. D. 101. He is the greatest authority of high Churchmen. Cardinal Baronius also considers Ignatius's Epistles to be one of the bulwarks of the doctrines of the popedom. Some care will be necessary in examining his writings. I merely mention, though I do not stand upon it, that many profound scholars seriously doubt the genuineness of the Epistles which go under his name. I shall only bring one reason before the reader, though many might be added. It is this: that viewing the character of Ignatius in no ordinary light as a witness, and an eminent martyr for the truth, several parts of these Epistles are a powerful reflection on the soundness of his judgment, if not on the goodness of his heart. Such *weak, silly rant*, and *rhodomontade*, is found running through them, as makes a Christian half ashamed to own it as coming from so eminent a martyr. Those who contend for the authority of these Epistles, seem to me to prefer the credit of their scheme of episcopacy to the character of Ignatius himself. It is probable the Epistles were greatly *corrupted* by some high advocates of priestly power and authority. Some parts of the Epistles, first published under his name, have been *acknowledged* HERETICAL, and have been rejected by the most learned men of the Church of England. "They laboured not only," says Archbishop Wake, "under many impertinencies unbecoming the character of that great man, but were fraught with many things that were altogether fabulous: nay, if we may credit Archbishop Usher, had some passages in them that tended to corrupt the very faith of Christ, in one of the most considerable points."* Many of the best continental divines, as Calvin, Salmasius, Blondel, Albertinus, and Daille, REJECT THE WHOLE. "The whole question," says Mosheim, "relating to the Epistles

* Abp. Wake's Prel. Disc., sec. 17.

of Ignatius in general, seems to me to labour under *much obscurity*, and to be embarrassed with many difficulties." * And even Archbishop Usher, whom high Churchmen must allow to be a competent and unexceptionable witness, having mentioned the opinion of Salmasius, that all the twelve Epistles are either counterfeits, or certainly corrupted by interpolations in many places, adds, "to which judgment I willingly subscribe: having *certain proof* that *six* of them are counterfeits; and that the *remaining six are corrupted by interpolations in very many places.*" † However, we will grant them to be genuine.

Now two points will be sufficient to settle with Ignatius. The first is, that, whatever he makes of bishops, he yet makes *presbyters as high* as we can desire for our argument. He says, the deacon "is *subject* to the *presbyters* AS to the LAW of *Jesus Christ:*"—"the PRESBYTERS PRESIDE in the place of the COUNCIL of the APOSTLES." ‡ "Be ye SUBJECT to your PRESBYTERS AS to the APOSTLES of Jesus Christ our hope." § "Let all *reverence* the *presbyters* AS the *sanhedrim of God*, and COLLEGE of APOSTLES." Same Ep. "Being subject to your bishop as to the command of God; *and* SO LIKEWISE to *the* PRESBYTERY." Id. "See that ye follow—the *presbyters* AS the APOSTLES." ‖ All the above passages are from Archbishop Wake's translation. If Ignatius's authority is worth any thing, it proves *presbyters* to be in the *place* of the *apostles*. This is surely enough for the most rigid Presbyterian.

The second point is, that he says, "Let no man do any thing of what belongs to the church separately from the bishops. Let that eucharist be looked upon as well established, which is either offered by the bishop, or by him to whom the bishop has given his consent. Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people also be; as where Jesus Christ is, there is the catholic church. It is NOT LAWFUL *without the bishop*, neither to *baptize*, nor to *celebrate* the holy communion; but WHATSOEVER *he shall approve of*, that is also pleasing unto God: that so whatever is done, may be sure and well done.—He that does

* Mosheim's Ecc. Hist., cont. i, part ii, chap. ii, sec. 20.
† Usheri Diss., p. 136; and see p. 13, ed. Oxon, 4to., 1644.
‡ Ep. to the Magnesians. ‖ Ep. to the Trallians.
§ Ep. to the Smyrnians.

any thing without his knowledge, ministers unto the devil."* There is no stronger passage in favour of high Church episcopacy in his Epistles than this. The term translated "LAWFUL," Εξον εστι, frequently means "*permitted*," as by *custom*, or *courtesy*: so Acts xxi, 37, "*May* I speak unto thee?" Acts ii, 29, "Men and brethren, *let* me freely speak unto you, Εξον ειπειν." Hence it does not necessarily mean *divine law*, but only what is matter of custom or courtesy. The expression, "*Let* no man do any thing of what belongs to the church separate from the bishop," simply signifies, that where a superintendent had been appointed for the *sake* of *order*, *that order* was to be *kept*. Very right. So say all churches where a superintendency has been established, though making no pretensions to divine right for it. To suppose the passage to mean that a presbyter *absolutely* had not power, by *divine right*, to *baptize*, to *celebrate* the holy communion, nor to *do* ANY THING that belongs to the church, except the bishop bade him, is absurd, and is confuted by Ignatius himself; for he says, "the PRESBYTERS are in the PLACE of the APOSTLES." Surely men that are the "*sanhedrim* of *God*, and the *college* of the *apostles*" have divine authority to *baptize*, &c., when occasion should require it, whether the bishop bade them or not. Indeed, *fifty places* might be quoted from COUNCILS, and better writers than the author of these Epistles, where this mode of expression means nothing but human arrangement. We find *bishops* themselves *forbid* by a council to do certain things *without* the *archbishop*.† Is the order of archbishops, then, by divine right also? These advocates will not say so. "No bishop was to be elected or ordained," says Bingham, "WITHOUT *their* (the metropolitans') consent and approbation: otherwise the *canons pronounce* both the *election* and the *ordination* NULL."‡ What will our high Churchmen make of this—a matter determined by the authority of *hundreds* of bishops in council? Will they say it has *divine right?* Then numbers of the English bishops' ordinations were NULL *ab initio;* for they frequently were *not* ordained by their *metropolitan, nor* with *his consent*. Nay, it WILL DESTROY

* Ep. ad Smyrn. sec. 8.
† See the Council of Antioch, (90 bishops.) A. D. 341, can. 9.
‡ Bingham, b. ii, chap. xvi, sec. 12.

ARCHBISHOP PARKER'S ORDINATION, *upon which all the ordinations* of the present bishops and clergy of the Church of England depend, For the canons require a metropolitan to be ordained by his *patriarch*, or, at least, by *all the bishops* of his province. Now Parker was ordained by neither, but *against* the consent of the *first*, and only by three or four, if any, of the last, many of the rest being *opposed* to his ordination.

Even *bishops* were not allowed to do ANY THING of importance WITHOUT the *presbyters*. Bishop Overall himself affirms this in his letters to Grotius,* "*Notum est antiquitus*, NIHIL *majoris momenti episcopum* SINE *concilio sui presbyterii fecisse*—It is a known matter that anciently the bishop did NOTHING of moment WITHOUT his council of presbyters." So Cyprian apologizes for ordaining only a subdeacon *without* the presbyters and deacons, Ep. 24.

But Ignatius says, "WHATEVER the bishops shall *approve* of, that is also *pleasing to God*." Now it is clear that he makes the power or authority of the bishop in *restraining* and in *permitting* to be *equal*. Whatever he could *prohibit* the presbyters from doing, he could equally *appoint* and *approve* of their doing the same thing. He could *restrain* them from *baptizing*, and he could *appoint* them to *baptize*. His authority in both respects was equal. Apply this to *ordaining* ministers. Suppose he could *restrain* presbyters from *ordaining:* he could *equally appoint* them to *ordain* ministers; and then their performance of this duty "WOULD BE PLEASING TO GOD." Then presbyters, *as presbyters*, have as much *inherent power* to ORDAIN, as they have to *baptize*, or to do ANY THING else in the *church*. This is clearly the doctrine of Ignatius. Now all Churchmen allow they have the power and authority *as presbyters to baptize*. They have, therefore, from the principles of Ignatius, power and authority to *ordain* ministers, to *confirm*, &c., as much as bishops have. The only difference was, that for the *honour* of the bishop, and by *ecclesiastic arrangement*, they were not to do these things without the *permission* of the bishop.

Hence, then, even Ignatius says nothing to prove high Church episcopacy of DIVINE RIGHT; but the contrary, that "*presbyters* are in the *place of the apostles*," "the

* *Epistolæ Præstantium Virorum*, p. 460, ed. second.

college of the *apostles*," "the *sanhedrim of God*." Stillingfleet says, "In all those thirty-five testimonies produced out of Ignatius's Epistles for episcopacy, I can meet with but one which is brought to prove the least semblance of an *institution of Christ* for episcopacy; and if I be not much deceived, the sense of that place is clearly mistaken too."* The bishop, as superintendent, *for* the *sake* of ORDER, had, by ecclesiastical arrangement, the oversight of all, and authority to regulate the administration of the affairs of the church. So have the Lutheran superintendents; so have the Wesleyan Methodist superintendents; but they and all the other ministers of those churches are *equal by divine right*. So were all the ministers in Ignatius's time.

Polycarp was contemporary with Ignatius. There is extant an Epistle under his name, having much greater marks of genuineness and purity than any of those under the name of Ignatius: indeed, there appears no reasonable ground of objection against it. He commences by saying, "Polycarp and the presbyters that are with him, to the church of God, which is at Philippi." He exhorts them to be "*subject* to the *presbyters* and deacons, as unto God and Christ." He *never* ONCE mentions such a word as *bishop* from the commencement to the conclusion. How different this from the episcopal MANIA of the pseudo-Ignatius! How different, too, from what would be the style of modern Episcopalians! Would a modern bishop write to the church or diocess of another bishop, and yet never mention such a term as bishop? No such thing. This proves, along with a thousand other things of the same character, which for brevity's sake we omit, that modern episcopacy, leaving out of question divine right, has no resemblance to the government of the church in the days of Clement and Polycarp.

Justin Martyr flourished about A. D. 155. The most celebrated passage in his Works, relating to the present question, is in his Apology, from c. 85 to 88. The president of the Christian assembly he denominates προεσως. In these chapters, this term, and this *only*, as designating the minister, occurs six times; neither the term bishop nor presbyter is used at all. The word simply means a president. Reeves, the translator of Justin, a Churchman,

*Iren. 309.

Justin Martyr

and who loses no opportunity of opposing *sectarians*, allows, in his notes on the passage, that the προεζως of Justin, the *probati seniores* of Tertullian, the *majores natu*, in Cyprian's Works, (Ep. 75,) and the προεζωτες πρεσβυτεροι, or presiding presbyters, of St. Paul, (1 Tim. iv, 17,) were *all one* and the *same*. Now Tertullian, Cyprian, (or rather Firmilian, the celebrated bishop of Cesarea, in Cappadocia,) and St. Paul, all mean PRESBYTERS. Their language cannot be otherwise interpreted without violence. "Presbyter," says Bishop Jewel,* "is expounded in Latin by *natu major*."† The bishop was, doubtless, included in the presbyter: they were both one. Indeed, Irenæus, in an Epistle to Victor, called in later days bishop of Rome, thus addresses him, (circa, A. D. 200,) "The PRESBYTERS who, before Soter, PRESIDED over that church which you now govern,—I mean Anicetus and Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus, and Xystus." Here this ancient and celebrated writer expressly calls those persons PRESIDING PRESBYTERS, whom later writers call bishops of Rome. This demonstrates that the PRESIDENT in each Christian church, in the time of Justin, was a *presbyter*.

Irenæus flourished about Ann. Dom. 184. He mentions both presbyter and bishop, but he uses them *synonymously*. Some persons who have only seen the PARTIAL *quotations* of high Church succession divines may doubt my assertion. However, they shall judge for themselves, and then decide what opinion they can have of the fairness of these writers. These divines have generally quoted Irenæus about the succession of bishops, as though he meant a succession of bishops, by divine right, and of *bishops*

* "If ye [Mr. Harding] had been either so sagely studied as ye pretend, and your friends have thought, ye might soon have learned that presbyter or priest is nothing else but SENIOR, that is, an elder, and that a priest and an elder are both one thing. And therefore, whereas St. Paul saith: Adversus *presbyterum* accusationem ne admiseris, St. Cyprian, translating the same, saith thus: Adversus *majorem natu* accusationem ne reciperis. Your own Dr. Thomas Aquina saith: Presbyter Græce, Latine senior, interpretatur. St. Hierome saith: Idem est presbyter qui episcopus. These two words, πρεσβυτερος, πρεσβυτατος, are expounded in Latin, *natu major*, natu maximus. 1 Tim. v. Cyprian ad Quirin, lib. iii, cap. 76. Thom. Secund. Secunda, quest. 184, art. 6, dist. 24, Cleros. Hieron. ed 1 Tit. c, i."—Bp. Jewel's Defence of the Apology, part vi, p. 527, fol. ad. 1609.

† Defence of the Apology, part vi, p. 527, fol. ed., 1609.

ALONE as *successors* of the apostles. Let us hear him on the other side. He is, in the following passage, speaking of some who left the *Scripture*, and pretended *tradition* for their errors. "But," says he, "when we appeal to that tradition which has been preserved to us by the SUCCESSIONS *of* PRESBYTERS in the churches—*quæ per* SUCCESSIONES PRESBYTERORUM *in ecclesiis custoditur*—they presume they are wiser not only than the presbyters, but even than the apostles, and that they have found the truth in a purer form."* In the next chapter he calls *this succession* the *succession* of *bishops*, which, as it is agreed on both sides, we need not quote. In the very celebrated Epistle, above mentioned, to Victor, bishop of Rome, he speaks of Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus, and Xystus, *presiding as presbyters* over the Church of Rome; though these persons, by later writers, are all reckoned as bishops of Rome. These presbyters are all, even by Papists and high Churchmen, put as *links* into the succession *chain:* they have no chain without them. He repeats the same mode of speaking of these presiding presbyters three times over in this letter, though a short one, and NEVER uses *any other:* never calls them bishops. He uses the word bishops as to the Asiatics, but not as to the Romans: which would almost lead one to think that the term presbyter, at *Rome*, in that age was *still* considered the *most honourable denomination*, as it certainly seems to have been in the apostles' days, and for some time after. For what provincial bishop would write to the archbishop of Canterbury, and referring him to half a dozen of his predecessors in that see, would yet never call them any thing but *presbyters*, except he thought the title was the most honourable one? "Would not any man now bee deemed *rude* and *sawcy*, who should talk in that style" to the archbishop?† Again, "Wherefore obedience ought to be rendered to those who ARE *presbyters* in the church, WHO *have*, as we *have* shown, *succession from the apostles*, and who, WITH the *succession of* THEIR *episcopacy*, have a sure deposite of the *truth* divinely granted to them according to the good pleasure of our heavenly Father."‡ These are said to be presbyters, that is, *properly such*, "*qui in eccle-*

* Lib. 3, c. 2. † Barrow's Supremacy, supp. v, p. 167, 4to. 1610.
‡ Lib. 4, c. 43.

sia SUNT PRESBYTERI." But these *presbyters* have the *true apostolical succession*, and, as presbyters, have *episcopacy:* that is, *preside* over the church, *rule* the church in common. In the next chapter, speaking still of presbyters as presiding over the church, he tells us that we ought to FORSAKE those who were *wicked*, though they held the chief seat, and that we ought to cleave to those who joined *purity* of *doctrine* to holiness of life: "Now those who are by many received as presbyters, yet serving their own lusts, and not having the fear of God before them; but, being puffed up with the *chief seats* (principalis consessio,) use others with contumely, and say to themselves, 'None see the evils we do in secret:' these are reproved by the Lord, who judges, not according to glorying appearances, but according to the heart. From ALL SUCH we ought to DEPART, and to *cleave* to those who preserve, as we have said, the DOCTRINE of the *apostles*, and, along with their order of presbyter, maintain sound words; and show, for the instruction and correction of others, an irreproachable conversation. The church will nourish such *presbyters;* of *whom* also the prophet (Isa. lx, 17) speaks, 'I will give thy princes in peace, and thy bishops in righteousness.' Of whom also the Lord spake, 'Who, therefore, is a good and wise servant, whom his Lord shall place *over his household*,'" &c.* What can be clearer than that Irenæus here speaks of presbyters and bishops as the same? He says, the prophet spake of these presbyters when he said, "I will give thy *bishops*," &c. Presbyters and bishops, therefore, with Irenæus, were the SAME ORDER, and *equally successors* of the apostles.

One point more Irenæus will help us to rectify. The high Church divines quote him as though he meant that a *succession* of PERSONS, viz., of bishops, according to their views, was ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY to the *existence* of Christianity and its ordinances. We shall see that he means no such thing. He says, as above, we are *to leave* those ministers *who leave the truth*, notwithstanding their pretence to personal succession. What he principally aims at is this, to prove an uncorrupted *tradition, succession*, or delivering down of *apostolical* TRUTH, FAITH, and *holiness* to succeeding generations; and he uses the argu-

* Lib. iv, cap. 44.

ment of a *succession* of *ministers*, called indifferently *presbyters* and *bishops*, to prove the *succession* of *truth* against the monstrous heresies of his day, in which the Scriptures were *denied* or *corrupted:* just as we use now, against infidels, the uninterrupted and uncorrupted *tradition* of the SCRIPTURES themselves, and Scripture TRUTH to the present day. Accordingly, Irenæus says, "We cannot know the plan of salvation, any otherwise than by those *persons* through whom the gospel has come down to us. This they first proclaimed by their *personal* ministry. *Afterward* they delivered the will of God to us in their divinely inspired *writings*, the sacred Scriptures, *which* were *henceforward* to be the FOUNDATION and PILLAR of our FAITH."* The heretics shuffled to avoid the force of this. "When we argue from the Scriptures, they (the heretics) *accuse* the *Scriptures* as not having the right doctrine, neither as *sufficient authority:* that they contain *views* so *diverse* that they *cannot be understood* by those who are ignorant of TRADITION."—How like Popery, Dr. Hook, and the Oxford Tract-men!—He then recites some of the ravings of the heretics, and says, "*Such* are the *persons* against whom we contend: persons whom *nothing* can *hold*, but who wriggle, *like serpents*, into every form, to escape from the grasp of truth. Wherefore, we must use EVERY MODE of arguing against them, that, being confounded with the discovery of their errors, we may, if possible, convert them to the truth."† The *personal succession* of ministers, (presbyters and bishops he calls them indifferently,) in the Christian church, was *one mode* of argument. This was *secondary* and *auxiliary* to another, which was the *succession* of the *doctrine* of Christian *truth*, the *succession* of the TRUE FAITH. Hear the great Protestant champion, Whitaker, in the days of Elizabeth, speaking of the succession maintained by the early fathers, Irenæus, &c.: "FAITH, therefore, is as it were the *soul* of this succession, which being wanting, a naked succession of persons is as a *dead body*. The fathers, indeed, always much more regarded the succession of *faith* than any unbroken series of men."‡ Irenæus first remarks that the apostles taught no such delirious tenets as the heretics held, nor any secret doctrines.

* Lib. iii, c. 1. † Lib. iii, c. 2.
‡ Whitakeri Opp., vol. i, p. 506, ed. Gen., 1610.

"Then," he saith, "the Christian church at Rome possessed this* *tradition* of the truth by the apostles, according to the *faith preached by them;* and proceeds to confirm this statement by mentioning the succession of ministers in that church: "We shall declare that which was delivered from the apostles, which the Church of Rome possesses, the FAITH they preached to mankind; and which has come down to us *through a succession of bishops* reaching to the present time." † Here a succession of persons is made *auxiliary* to the main point, the succession of faith. We allow this argument its full weight. Where a real succession of faithful ministers has existed, it is *one mode* of proving the *true faith*. But does Irenæus say that there is *no other* mode, that no churches have the faith who have not this succession? He never says so. He says, "the *Scriptures* are *henceforward*, from the time of the apostles, to be the *pillar* and *ground* of our *faith*." ‡ Does he say that all are to be received as true ministers who are in the succession? No. He tells us we are to *forsake* those whose lives are *wicked*, and to cleave to the good.

Tertullian flourished about A. D. 198. Many readers know that he is quoted with as much triumph by the succession divines as though it were impossible for us to find any thing in Tertullian to prove the identity of bishops and presbyters, or against their doctrine of succession. Let us

* The reader will see the importance of keeping in mind the difference between *tradition*, as matter of UNWRITTEN REPORT, and *tradition* as the *conveying* from age to age of a WRITTEN WORD. The first kind of tradition is *necessarily* confused and UNCERTAIN: it is not in human nature to prevent it. The second kind is capable of the *utmost certainty* that historic evidence can give, and that human language can communicate. Now it was the first kind of tradition, *oral tradition, unwritten report*, that the *heretics* pretended was to be the *rule* of interpreting the Scriptures; so do the *Papists* and *high Church* divines generally. The second kind of *tradition*, that is, the *conveying down* from generation to generation the *truth* of God, and the *faith* preached by the *apostles*, by conveying the WRITTEN RECORD of this *faith*, emphatically THE SCRIPTURES, — this is the *tradition* of the *primitive church:* this is the TRADITION of *Protestantism*. *Popery*, and *semi-popery*, in all their ramifications, are founded on *oral tradition, unwritten report;* and are *full* of UNCERTAINTY and CONFUSION. True *Protestantism* is founded on the SCRIPTURES, the *written record* of God's will, and has, in its mode of communication and interpretation, the UTMOST POSSIBLE CLEARNESS AND CERTAINTY.

† Lib. iii, c. 3. ‡ Lib. iii, c. 3.

examine Tertullian. In the work usually quoted on this subject, he writes against the heretics, such as those referred to by Irenæus. He is designing to show, that what is *first* in doctrine is the truth; and that the heresies he opposes sprung up *after* the apostles' times, and were, therefore, extraneous and false: "But if any of the heretics dare to *connect themselves* with the *apostolic age*, that they may seem to be derived from the apostles, as existing under them, we may say, 'Let them, therefore, declare the *origin* of their *churches:* let them exhibit the *series* of their bishops, so coming down by a continued *succession* from the beginning, as to show their first bishop to have had some apostle or apostolical man as his predecessor or ordainer, and *who continued* in the *same faith* with the *apostles*.' For *this* is the *way* in which the apostolical churches calculate the *series* of their *bishops*."* This passage is the triumph of succession divines. Now, that a *succession of ministers* was rightly urged against those who, by *rejecting* or *corrupting* the SCRIPTURES, introduced into the Christian church the wildest ravings, such as the Cerinthians, the Valentinians, Basilidians, &c., we have shown in our observations on Irenæus; to which place we request the reader to refer, as the subject is the same in both authors. BUT IS THIS ALL Tertullian says about the RULE of FAITH, in opposition to heretics? The reader shall judge of the conduct of those who would lead others to believe it to be so. Within half-a-dozen lines of the passage above quoted, he shows that he only meant this *personal succession as one mode* of showing the MAIN *point*, viz., the *succession of apostolical* FAITH: "But if the heretics *feign* or *fabricate such a succession*, THIS *will* NOT *help them*. For their DOCTRINE itself, compared with the *doctrine of the apostles*, will, by its own diversity and contrariety, pronounce against them, that it had not, as its author, either any apostle or apostolical man; for as there was no difference among the apostles in their doctrine, so neither did any apostolical men teach any thing contrary to them; except those who DIVIDED *from the* APOSTLES, and PREACHED DIFFERENTLY. TO THIS FORM of trial will appeal be made by those churches HENCEFORWARD daily established,

* De Præscript, c. 32.

which, though they have neither *any of the apostles nor any apostolical men* for their *founders*, yet ALL *agreeing* in the SAME FAITH, are, from this CONSANGUINITY OF DOCTRINE, to be esteemed NOT LESS APOSTOLICAL than the former. Therefore our churches having appealed to BOTH *forms* of proving themselves to be apostolical, let the heretics show some form by which they can prove the same. But they cannot show this; for it does not exist; therefore they are not received into communion by those churches which are *every way* apostolical, FOR THIS REASON, because of the DIFFERENCE of their FAITH, which is in no sense apostolical." O! Tertullian, this is hard! What! will not a *succession of bishops* HELP *us* AT ALL, *without a succession* of the FAITH taught by the apostles? So he says. But what is a heavier stroke still, he says the *succession* of FAITH ALONE will make a church *equally apostolical* as those who have the succession of faith and the succession of persons too. THIS IS DEATH to the scheme of our high Church divines. He has much more to the same purpose in this very treatise:—"What if a bishop, or a deacon, or a widow, or a virgin, or a doctor in the church, or a confessor, shall have fallen from the *faith*, shall *heresy by them* obtain the *authority of the truth?* What! do we *prove* FAITH BY PERSONS, and not rather PERSONS by the FAITH?" c. 3. "Our Lord instructs us that many ravening *wolves* will be found in sheep's clothing. Who are these ravening wolves, except deceitful workers, that lurk *in the church* to infest the flock of Christ? Who are *false prophets*, but FALSE PREACHERS? Who are *false apostles*, except those who preach an ADULTERATED GOSPEL?" c. 4. Hear this, ye semi-popish succession divines! who frequently preach for *doctrine the commandments of men*, and make void the law of God by your doctrine of traditions. But to proceed with Tertullian on the succession of FAITH: "Immediately after the day of Pentecost, the twelve *apostles*, which by interpretation means *missionaries*, first having preached the *faith* to the churches throughout Judea, then went into the whole world, publishing the *very same doctrine* of the *same faith* to the nations of the earth. Churches were established in every city by the apostles; from which churches the SUCCESSION of FAITH, and the *seeds* of DOCTRINE, were

derived to other churches; and daily continue to be derived, to GIVE them EXISTENCE *as churches.* And BY THIS PROCESS *these* succeeding *churches will be esteemed* APOSTOLICAL, as the offspring of apostolical churches." Here the reader sees again it is *faith*, and *faith only*, that is, the true doctrine of the gospel, which constitutes the ESSENTIAL CHARACTER *of a Christian church.* Again, "I am an HEIR of the *apostles.* As they provided for me as by WILL, committing the same to the *faith*, and establishing it as by OATH, so *I hold it.* But they have *disinherited* you *heretics*, and cast you out as aliens and enemies; BUT WHENCE are heretics aliens and enemies to the apostles? it is by *opposition* of DOCTRINE." C. 37.

But what says Tertullian about the *order of bishops* by DIVINE RIGHT? You shall hear: "The *highest priest*, who is the *bishop*, has the right of administering baptism. Then the presbyters and deacons, yet NOT WITHOUT the *authority of the bishop*, BECAUSE of the HONOUR of the church." Well, (our opponents will reason,) here, at least, bishops are high priests: now the high priest was an order by divine right superior to the other priests: it follows, then, bishops are a divine order above presbyters. Besides, presbyters can do nothing without the bishop's authority. What can be more decisive? So triumph our high Churchmen from this passage. Their triumph shall be short. They have not generally the honesty to *quote* the *very next words*, as this would spoil all in a moment. We will give the whole passage: "The highest priest, who is the bishop, has the *right* of administering baptism. Then the *presbyters* and *deacons*, yet *not without the authority* of the bishops, BECAUSE of the *honour of the church.* THIS BEING PRESERVED, *peace is preserved.* OTHERWISE the RIGHT belongs even to *laymen.* However, the *laity* ought especially to *submit* humbly and modestly to the *discipline* or *ecclesiastical* regulations of the church in these matters, and not assume the office of the bishop, seeing their *superiors*, the *presbyters* and *deacons*, SUBMIT to the same. Emulation is the mother of divisions. 'All things are lawful to me,' said the most holy Paul, 'but all things are not expedient.' Let it suffice that you use *your* LIBERTY in cases of necessity, when the condition of the person, or the circumstances of time or place compel

you to it."* This is too plain to need comment. To prevent divisions, as Jerome says, to secure the peace of the church by taking away emulation, the mother of divisions, Tertullian shows, one presbyter was placed over the rest, as the *highest priest*, that is, the highest PRESBYTER; and yet by no divine right: all, even laymen have, he says, "the RIGHT." His words are, "*Alioquin etiam laicis* JUS *est.*" This is enough for our present argument, and, with other bearings of his words, we, at present, have nothing to do.

In his most celebrated work, his Apology, while describing the order and government of the church, he says, "PRÆSIDENT *probati quique* SENIORES, &c. Approved elders or *presbyters preside* among us: having received that *honour* not by money, but *by the suffrages* of their *brethren*," cap. 39.† Reeves, who was, as has been remarked, a rigid Churchman, in his note on the place, says, "The presiding elders here are undoubtedly the same with the προεζως in Justin Martyr." (Vid. p. 109 of this Essay.) Here the *presbyters preside*. One as *primus presbyter*, as the highest priest or highest presbyter, was, *by the suffrages of his brethren*, appointed or ordained to preside over the rest; and, for distinction's sake, was called *bishop*. So in another very noted passage in his Præscriptions against Heretics, he speaks of the apostolical churches "over which the APOSTOLICAL CHAIRS still *presided*." The order was usual, in the meetings of ministers in the primitive church, for the ministers' *chairs* to be set in a *semi-circle*. The *middle chair was raised* a little above the rest. The highest presbyter or priest sat in this, and the other presbyters or priests sat round him. The deacons were never allowed chairs: they always stood. I mention the fact without justifying it. Now these were the chairs Tertullian means. The *presbyters* sat in them, and thus in council *presided over the church in common*. So says Jerome, "The church was *governed* by

* De Baptismo, c. 17.

† "Seniores are, in the Greek language, called presbyters," says the learned Popish ecclesiastical historian, Cabassutius. Notitia Eccle., p. 53. Indeed this is, beyond all doubt, the direct and proper sense. Scapula says, "πρεσβυτερος, senior:" Schrevelius: "πρεσβυτερος, presbyter, senior;" and Suicer: "πρεσβυτερος, id est, senior.

the *common council of the presbyters.*" Here, then, PRESBYTERS are *apostolical successors, sit in apostolical chairs,* and are the SAME ORDER with *bishops.*

Clemens Alexandrinus flourished about A. D. 204. He says but little that bears on the subject before us. A passage in the sixth book of his Stromata is sometimes referred to as supporting high Church episcopacy; but a close examination of it will show that it supports nothing of the kind. He tells his reader, in the beginning of this book, that his design in it, and in the seventh, is to describe the *true "Gnostic,"* or the *perfect man.* He properly begins by showing, that he must be like God. He thus proceeds:—"Seeing God is indeed the good Parent, he is permanently and immutably engaged in beneficence. Inactive goodness is no goodness: true goodness is certain to be engaged in acts of goodness. He therefore who having subdued his passions, and having attained true self-denial, daily practices with increasing success true beneficence, he is a perfect Gnostic, and is equal to angels. Thus shining as the sun in acts of goodness, he sedulously proceeds by true knowledge, and the love of God, *like the apostles,* to the *mansion of holiness.* The apostles were not chosen as apostles because of any natural excellence or inherent virtue of theirs; for Judas was elected along with the rest; but they were elected by Him who saw the end from the beginning. Matthias was not elected with the rest, yet when he had shown himself worthy to be an apostle, he was appointed in the place of Judas. Hence it follows, also, that those now who walk in the Saviour's commandments, living as perfect Gnostics according to the gospel, shall be *enrolled among the apostles.* He is truly a presbyter of the church, and he is a true deacon or servant of the will of God, who does and teaches what God has commanded, and NOT he who has been *ordained by the imposition of hands;* neither is a presbyter counted a righteous man, because he is a presbyter, but a righteous man, because he is a righteous man, is enrolled in the *true presbytery;* and though upon earth he be not honoured with *sitting in the first throne,* yet he shall sit on those *four and twenty thrones* judging the people, as John speaks in the Revelation. There is only one covenant of salvation, coming down from the creation of

the world, through different ages and generations, in various modes of administration. It follows, therefore, that there is only one unchangeable salvation, given by one and the same God, and applied by one and the same Lord, (Jesus Christ,) according to different dispensations. For which cause the middle wall that separated the Jews from the Gentiles has been taken away, that so of twain he might make one peculiar people; and that they both might come to a unity of faith: both have one and the same election. And of the elect, whether Jews or Gentiles, those are more particularly so, who, according to this perfect knowledge, have been gathered from the church on earth, and honoured with the magnificent glory of sitting on the *four and twenty thrones*, as judges and administrators, in that assembly where the grace of time is crowned with a double increase. For even in the church here on earth, there are promotions of bishops, of presbyters, and of deacons: which are, I suppose, imitations of angelic glory, *and of that state* which awaits those who walk in the footsteps of the apostles, and in the perfect righteousness of the gospel. These, the apostle tells us, being received up into the clouds, shall first be engaged in suitable services, and then advanced to the presbytery, according to the promotion of glory, (for glory differs from glory,) until they grow to a perfect man."

We have given the whole of this passage that the reader may judge for himself. First, then, it is plain that Clemens set a comparatively light estimate upon ordination by imposition of hands, if separate from true piety. Secondly, he says he supposes that the "promotions of bishops, of presbyters, and of deacons, are *imitations* of angelic glory;" by which he appears only to mean *heavenly glory* in general. He never mentions different *orders* of angels in the passage: the writer of the Revelation, to whom he refers, never uses the word archangel, or *orders* of angels. Thirdly, as to this angelic or heavenly glory, he explains himself by speaking of the *four and twenty elders* (presbyters) as the *summit* of it—the *highest perfection* of that glory, that indeed in which the apostles are found. No higher place is assigned in the Scriptures to the apostles themselves, than to sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Matt. xix, 28. And he makes

being "like angels," being "like the apostles." He speaks of his "perfect man," being "enrolled among the apostles," and explicates his meaning by going on to show, that though he should not on earth be "honoured with sitting in a first throne, yet he shall sit in the PRESBYTERY of those *four and twenty thrones*, judging the people:" the apostles, therefore, according to Clemens, sit on such thrones. They belong to that presbytery. That presbytery is the mansion of holiness for the perfect man. Here is no place for the bishop over this presbytery, without placing him over the apostles themselves. With Clemens, then, nothing belonging to the church, either in heaven or on earth, is higher than a true presbyter. We hope multitudes of good bishops will be there; but, if Clemens be right, it will be their highest glory to be *perfect* PRESBYTERS.

But Clemens has a passage in the beginning of the seventh book of the same work, in which he clearly maintains the identity of bishops and presbyters. Speaking of the public worship of God, in opposition or contrast to mental worship, he says, "One part of it is performed by *superior* ministers, another part by *inferior* ministers. The *superior* part is performed by *presbyters:* the *inferior*, or servile part, by the *deacons*." Here bishops are included in the presbyters, that is, they are one and the same order and office. This is another important testimony against high Church episcopacy.

Origen flourished about A. D. 230. All he says is conformable to the statement of Jerome, viz., that presbyters and bishops are *substantially* the same order: the *circumstantial* difference is, that one presbyter was set over the rest, and distinguished by the denomination of *bishop*. If we show this substantial identity, it will follow, of course, that the difference is only circumstantial. Let us hear Origen: "Dost thou think that they who are honoured with the priesthood, and glory in their *priestly order*, walk according to that order? In like manner, dost thou suppose the *deacons* also walk according to *their order?* Whence then is it that we often hear reviling men exclaim, 'What a bishop!' 'What a presbyter!' or, 'What a deacon is this fellow!' Do not these things arise from hence, that the *priest* or the *deacon*, had, in some thing, gone contrary to

a 9
Origen 230.

his order, and had done something against the *priestly*, or the *Levitical* order?" * Here is the *priesthood* and *priestly order*, and the *Levitical order:* the *bishop and presbyter* are EQUALLY put into the *first*, that is, the *priesthood*, or *priestly order;* and deacons are noticed in the place or order of the Levites. The bishops and presbyters are spoken of as *one* and the *same order*. In another part, speaking of the queen of Sheba admiring the order of Solomon's servants, Origen's lively imagination supposes that Solomon's household typified the church of God; and Solomon's servants, the ministers of the church:—"Imagine the *ecclesiastical* ORDER, SITTING in the *seats* or *chairs* of *bishops* and *presbyters*. She saw also the array of *servants standing* to wait in their service. This (as it seems to me) speaks of the *order of* deacons *standing* to attend on divine service."† Here one and the same ecclesiastical *order* includes both bishops and presbyters. Again: "What will it profit me to *sit* in a HIGHER *chair*, if my works are not answerable to my dignity?" ‡ This is his mode of representing the *circumstantial* difference of a bishop, occupying the dignity of a "*higher chair*," in sitting, with his co-presbyters, to preside over the church. For he says the *presbyters preside* over the church too. Thus, addressing his hearers in Hom. 7, on Jeremiah, he says, "WE, of the CLERICAL ORDER, who PRESIDE *over you*." Now every one knows that Origen was NEVER any thing more than a *presbyter*. Speaking in another place of the ambition of some persons to be great in the church, he says, "They first desire to be deacons, but not such as the Scripture describes, but such as devour widows' houses, and for pretence make long prayers, and therefore shall receive a heavier judgment. Such deacons consequently will go about to seize the HIGH *chairs* of presbyters—PRIMAS *cathedras*. Some also, not content with that, attempt *more*, in order that they may be called *bishops*, that is, *rabbi;* but they ought to understand that a *bishop* must be *blameless*, and have the rest of the qualities described there, (Titus i, 6, &c.,) so that *though* men should *not* give such a one the NAME of *bishop*, yet *he will* BE *a bishop before God*."§ This is the general style of Origen on this subject, and the substance of what

* Hom. 2, in Num.
† Hom. 2, in Cant.
‡ Hom. 6, in Ezek.
§ Tract. 24, in Matt. 23

occurs in his Works, on the matter. It is clear enough that *Jerome has given us the sense of Origen*, as well as of the rest of the ancients. He was perfectly acquainted with Origen's opinion, and translated many of his works. Bishops and presbyters, *with Origen*, were the *same order; they* RULED the church *in common*, the PRESBYTERS PRESIDING with the bishop: *he* having *a higher chair*, and being *distinguished* by the name of *bishop*.

Cyprian flourished about A. D. 250. He was a great and good man, and nobly sealed the truth with his blood as a martyr of Christ. However, he certainly had somewhat inflated views of the dignity of a bishop, and is considered to be as high as any of the primitive fathers in his notions on the subject. Yet they amount to *no more* than Jerome's statement. Let the man that says they do, produce the proof. As high language may be produced from Jerome as any used by Cyprian; yet Jerome expressly tells us his sober view was, that, by divine right, bishops and presbyters were the same. The language, therefore, that Cyprian uses, is to be interpreted as consistent with this identity of bishops and presbyters. It is of much importance to keep this in mind. Another thing may assist the reader's judgment here. He has seen the levelling views of Tertullian. Now it is well known that Cyprian was SO PASSIONATE an ADMIRER of Tertullian, as *never to let* A DAY pass without reading some part of his writings; and his language, in calling for his Works to be brought him regularly for this purpose, was, "DA MAGISTRUM—*Give me the master.*" The admiring scholar must resemble his master. We shall see, even under Cyprian, that the church was *ruled in common* by the bishops and presbyters. Cyprian did not suppose he ought to DO ANY THING of moment in his church *without* the council of his clergy. Writing to his presbyters and deacons, he says, "From the beginning of my episcopacy I determined to do *nothing* of my own accord, but only by *your council*, and with the *consent* of the people. When, by the grace of God, I return unto you, then we will, *as our mutual honour requires, confer in common* upon those things which have been done, or which still remain to be done."* But he goes further than this. He shows his opinion that the presbyters had *powers*, by

* Ep. 6, ed. Pamel, 1589.

divine right, to *perform* ANY of a bishop's duties in his absence. In his seclusion from the rage of his persecutors, he writes to his presbyters and deacons, saying, "I beseech you, according to your faith and religion, that you perform your own duties, and *also those belonging to me*, so that *nothing* may be wanting either as to *discipline* or diligence." Ep. 5. Again, having mentioned matters of church *government:* "I rely upon your love and your religion, which I well know, and by *these letters* I exhort and COMMIT THE CHARGE to you, that you, whose presence does not expose you to such peril, would discharge MY duty, act *in my place*, (*vice mea*,) and perform ALL those things which the *administration* of the church requires." Ep. 6. These passages are decisive in proof, that *substantially*, the bishop and presbyter were in Cyprian's opinion the same. The PRESIDING power of the clergy is very strongly put by him, when, in writing to Cornelius, bishop of Rome, he speaks of them as "compresbyters of Cornelius," Ep. 42; and "the most illustrious CLERGY PRESIDING WITH THE BISHOP *over the church*." Ep. 55. Again, as "the sacred and venerable *consistory of his clergy*." Ep. 55, p. 107. He applies the term *propositus*, president, as well as pastor, to the presbyters and to the bishops in common, Ep. 10, 11, 23, and 62. Indeed, in Ep. 20, he applies it to presbyters alone, as distinct from the bishop. Cyprian uses the term *collega* for a bishop, very frequently. The fourth council of Carthage, A. D. 398, thus speak on the subject: "As in the church, and in the concession of the presbyters, the bishop sits in a higher seat than the presbytery, so in other places let him know that he is truly a colleague, *collega*, of the presbyters: can. 35." This was in the very city in which Cyprian had been bishop. There were two hundred and fourteen bishops in the council, among whom was the famous St. Augustine, at that time bishop of Hippo. This canon became embodied in the canon law, and makes part of the law of the Romish Church to this day. In his angry Epistle to Pupian, a bishop and confessor, when put upon the point of clearing himself from some charges of pride, haughtiness, &c., which Pupian had mentioned to him in a letter, he stands in the defence of the *divine authority* of his *office* in the church: he says the Lord strengthened this divine autho-

rity *by a revelation in a dream;* and he places it upon this *that he was* A PRIEST, *sacerdos.* None of our high Churchmen deny that a presbyter is a priest or *sacerdos.* The council of Carthage, in the canon just now mentioned, use the word *sacerdotes* for presbyters only, "*Episcopus—collegam se sacerdotum esse cognoscat*—let the bishop know that he is the colleague of the *priests* or *presbyters.*" Such is the solemn determination of two hundred and fourteen bishops, the great Augustine among them. Cabassute, the learned Romish historian of the councils, says of this council, "Never were more excellent and comprehensive regulations made for church discipline than in its council; so that its decrees may be said to be a *storehouse* of instruction as to the regulation of the whole *order* of the clergy." Here, again, then, the bishop and presbyter are in substance the same. Indeed, according to Dr. Barrow's view of the following passage, Cyprian distinctly declares that, at the first, "*for a time,*" there were no bishops as now; but that they were *afterward,* and by *human* authority, constituted to take away schisms, exactly according to Jerome's statements. Cyprian says, "Heresies are sprung up, and schisms grown from no other root but this, because God's priest was not obeyed; nor was there one priest or bishop *for a time* in the church, nor a judge thought on *for a time* to supply the room of Christ." Ep. 55. "Where," says Dr. Barrow, "that by the church is meant any particular church, and by priest a bishop of such church, any one not bewitched with prejudice by the tenor of St. Cyprian's discourse, will easily discover."*

The Epistle on the Unity of the Church will develop the same thing. He explains and confirms his views by the case of the apostles. Peter, he thinks, had the *first* grant of the keys, though all had equal power. "*After* the resurrection, *each* and *all* of the other apostles had EQUAL power given to that of PETER." This, he supposes, gives a *principle of unity* a kind of *headship,* with EQUALITY of power among ALL. Having laid down his scheme in the apostles, he applies it to all ministers. "ALL are PASTORS, but the *flock* is only *one,* which was fed by *all* the apostles with *unanimous consent.*" He proceeds to point out the duty of keeping this unity in general, and

* Barrow's Pope's Supremacy, p. 141, ed. 4to., 1680.

shows the importance of the bishops of different parts of the church acting on the same plan, in order to prevent the scheme of Novatus and others, who tried to gain over, and did gain over, some of the bishops to their side. This was good advice. Then "all ministers are pastors," as really as all the apostles were apostles; and one person in each city or district having a *kind* of *headship* over others, for the sake of *unity*, perfectly consists with *equal powers* among *all;* as much so as that the apostles had *all equal power*, notwithstanding the *headship* of Peter. Whether Cyprian was right or wrong in his opinion about Peter's headship, makes no difference to our present argument. We give his scheme merely to show Cyprian's views of the *substantial identity* of bishops and presbyters, with the *shadow* of a *distinction* between them in the *headship* of the bishop. The remark again easily suggests itself, that the same mode of arguing which our high Churchmen employ for *their* view of bishops, *jure divino*, is employed with equal plausibility by the *Papists* for the UNIVERSAL headship of the POPE. Cyprian maintained the DIVINE RIGHT OF EQUALITY among all pastors, and that the *difference* was *circumstantial* and *nonessential*. The contrary tends to Popery. So the celebrated high Church Dodwell fairly pushes himself, on this very point in Cyprian, to this clear establishment of the *popedom*— "Christ, as the head of the church, is NOT SUFFICIENT to its *unity*, but there must be besides a *visible head* in the visible church."* Glorious news for Popery! And all are doomed as *schismatics* to *eternal damnation* by Dodwell and the Oxford Tract-men, who do not submit to this Popish dogma!! Cyprian, however, directs the people to *forsake wicked* ministers. He, says, "A people *obedient* to the *Lord's commands*, and fearing God, ought to SEPARATE themselves from a wicked bishop, and not partake of the sacraments of a sacrilegious priest, seeing they *chiefly* have the power of electing worthy ministers, and of rejecting the unworthy." Ep. 68.

Bishop Beveridge and the learned Dodwell have selected the following as the strongest passage in Cyprian for high Church episcopacy. If this can be shown to fail that scheme, then nothing in Cyprian will support it. As

* Dodwelli Diss. Cyprian, No. 7, sec. 22.

Cyprian is, perhaps, the highest in his notions on this subject of all the genuine fathers, it will conduce to the purpose of our argument to give this passage a thorough examination. The passage is in his "Epistle to the LAPSED, who themselves had written to Cyprian about the peace or reconciliation to the church, which Paul, the martyr, "had given to them." The passage is as follows:— "Our Lord, (whose precepts we are obliged to reverence and observe,) when arranging matters that regard the honour of the bishop and the order of his church, thus speaks in the gospel, and says to Peter, 'I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, shall be loosed in heaven.' Hence the ordination of bishops, and the arrangement of the church, have, through different times and successions, come down to the present, so that the church is placed upon the bishops; and all acts of the church are governed by these same presidents of the church. Seeing then this is *established by divine law*, I marvel that certain persons"—these lapsers—"should have the temerity to write to me in such a manner,"—telling him, (Ep. 29,) that they did not need his (Cyprian's) letters of peace, since Paul, the martyr, had given them such letters—"seeing," says Cyprian, "the church is constituted of the bishop, the clergy, and of all the faithful of the people. Far be it indeed from the truth of the case and from the long-suffering of God, that the church should consist in the number of the lapsed."

Here then let us, first, explain the case of the *lapsed:* secondly, the laws of church government in Cyprian's time, on this and similar matters.

First, the *lapsed*. These were persons who had fallen from their faith in the persecution. They were eager to be admitted to the peace of the church, before they had given those proofs of their recovery from their fall which were then generally judged necessary in such cases. Some of the martyrs, (persons who had survived their sufferings in the persecution,) from the honours they had gained by their constancy, had obtained great influence in

the church, and had, though only laymen, given letters of peace to the lapsed, *without the concurrence* of the bishop and of the clergy in general. Some few of the *presbyters* had acted in the same disorderly manner, "contemning the bishop and arrogating the WHOLE *authority* in this matter to themselves." Ep. 10.

Secondly, let us explain the laws of church government, in Cyprian's time, on this and similar matters. Cyprian then himself, in numberless places, states that these laws required the *mutual concurrence* of the bishop, the presbyters, the deacons, and of all the faithful of the church; so that he could not, "*durst not*," he says, do any thing of importance without them; of course, no individuals, as a party, could do any thing without him and the other clergy with him. This law he expressly and repeatedly applies to such cases as ordaining readers, deacons, &c., and he expressly applies it to this case of reconciling the lapsed. In this act the bishop and the clergy *both* equally *laid their hands* upon the lapsed in restoring them to the peace of the church—"*manu eis ab episcopo* ET CLERO *imposita.*" Ep. 10.

The *question in dispute*, then, was *not* between the bishop and the presbyters: *nothing of the kind;* but between the bishop, with the clergy in general on one side, and a faction in the church on the other. Cyprian claims *no sole* powers for the bishop. He repeatedly acknowledges that the power and authority of the bishop was *so* LIMITED, that he could do *nothing* of importance of himself. His office was to convene the church, and preside over, or superintend, the acts of the church: "all acts of the church are governed by these presidents." He was, then, nothing more, by Cyprian's own account, than a *limited superintendent, unable to do any thing of general importance* ALONE; *but whose office it was to superintend all the affairs and proceedings of the church, whether those proceedings were by the ministers or the people, separately or conjointly.* Presbyters could, in an emergency, exercise all the powers of this office; for so Cyprian himself requests and commands them to perform *all things in his office* that belongs to the government of the church. This superintendency Cyprian (though his meaning is not clear) seems to think is *established by divine law:* his proofs are,

the authority given to Peter, the ordinations of bishops the arrangements of the church, and the successions of bishops to each other. Sometimes, however, he seems to have doubted this point, viz., that this superintendency was established by divine law; for in the passage above given from him by Dr. Barrow, he says there was no such president or judge *for a time* in the church, and that this was the cause of the heresies that arose for want of it. But Cyprian is very expert at using *divine authority*. He pleads his "*night visions—nocturnas visiones*"—for this Ep. 10. He styles the election of Cornelius by the clergy and people, "the *judgment of God* and of Christ." Ep. 46 and 52. This is frequently his way of answering his adversaries on disputed points. So in some disputed ordinations, Ep. 55; and similar things in many other places, he thus makes them to be by divine authority. For Cyprian to plead THIS KIND of *divine authority* for this superintendency, amounts to little; and such certainly appears to be his style of reasoning in the passage in dispute. This limited superintendency, then, is Cyprian's episcopacy; and *such* is the divine right which he pleads for this *limited* superintendency. This is the very utmost that the strongest passage in Cyprian, himself the strongest advocate in antiquity, can prove. Does this, then, establish high Church episcopacy? Cyprian, who was the archbishop of that part of Africa—yea, Cyprian durst not, could not, do any thing of importance without consulting his presbyters and deacons; and frequently the people also: his presbyters in his absence, when need required, could perform all that belongs to his office without him. Will this superintendency satisfy a high Church bishop? no, verily, nor a low Church bishop either. When it was proposed at the conference, at Worcester House, about the king's (Charles II.) declaration, that "the bishops should exercise their church power *with the council and consent of presbyters*," Bishop Cosins (one of the most learned bishops in the canons, councils, and fathers) presently replied, "If your majesty grants this, you will UNBISHOP *your bishops*." See p. 52 of this Essay.

FIRMILIAN, bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia, was very celebrated in his day. He was *contemporary* with Cyprian. A very long letter of his is found in Cyprian's Works.

He says "All power and grace is in the church, in which PRESBYTERS PRESIDE, and have the POWER of baptizing, *confirming*, and ORDAINING. *Omnis potestas et gratia in ecclesia constituta sit, ubi* PRÆSIDENT MAJORES NATU, QUI *et baptizandi, et* MANUM IMPONENDI *et* ORDINANDI, *possident* POTESTATEM." *This is every way a* DECISIVE TESTIMONY. The *manner* in which he puts it, shows that he had not a suspicion that the assertion had any thing in it contrary to Cyprian's views. Had Cyprian believed in the *divine right* of the *order of bishops*, as possessing the SOLE POWER and AUTHORITY of ORDINATION and CONFIRMATION, he would necessarily have opposed the doctrine of Firmilian as a dangerous heresy. He did not. The consequence is plain: he did not hold such a view of the divine right of bishops.

The decisive language of Firmilian gives a proper key to Cyprian. The letter of Firmilian has the most perfect authenticity. Firmilian is *equal*, or even *superior authority* to Cyprian himself. Eusebius (Eccles. Hist., l. 6, c. 26) says, "*he was very famous.*" "He made," says Howel, "A MUCH MORE considerable figure in the church at that time than the *bishop of Rome. Firmilian was president of this council*," that is the council of Antioch.* Firmilian's testimony is as high and as *decided* as language can make it. And it does not speak of isolated facts, but of the PRACTICE of the church. It was the practice then for presbyters to preside over the church, to *confirm*, and to ORDAIN. Suppose this chiefly to have been confined to the country of Firmilian, that is, to Asia Minor; this is abundantly enough. Firmilian was known over the whole Christian world. The PRACTICE was NEVER *condemned:* the *ordinations* were NEVER OBJECTED to. This case is worth a THOUSAND single instances of ordination; for such a matter could not be *established* as *practice*, and then continued as practice, in the most celebrated part of the Christian world at that time, without resulting in the *ordination* of thousands of ministers.

We have now gone through all the principal writers that speak on the subjects in question, during the FIRST THREE CENTURIES; and we see that their authority utterly fails to maintain the views of our high Church divines on the

* Howel's Pontificate, p. 24.

order of bishops and APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION; and establishes the contrary.

A few observations on some of the later fathers shall close this section.

Athanasius flourished A. D. 350. Some writers on episcopacy quote an Epistle of his to a monk named Dracontius, in favour of bishops by divine right, as an order with powers incompatible with the office of presbyters. Here is the usual fallacy of such writers, in presuming that any mention of bishops always means SUCH *an order* of bishops as *this*. Indeed they must write upon this fallacy, or they must drop their pens. But this is begging the question, and proves nothing. Now in this Epistle of Athanasius there is not a syllable about the difference between bishops and presbyters. The substance of the whole is this—Whether a monk, who was a layman, should enter the Christian ministry and brave the dangers that then threatened all in that office; or whether he should, coward like, shun those dangers by remaining in the desert and in the cell. Athanasius presses the argument that to despise this ministry, there spoken of as to a bishop, was to despise the ordinance of Christ. Very true. We all believe this. But what does it prove as to the question before us? just nothing. Such are the best of their attempts at proving their scheme from the fathers of *any* age, either early or late. We shall not swell this volume by a lengthened exposure of them. The case of Ischyras's ordination, mentioned by Athanasius, is not decisive for either side of the argument; though a thorough examination of it would perhaps be decidedly against the high Church scheme.*

Ambrose flourished about A. D. 370. A commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, published in his Works, is sometimes supposed to have been the work of Hilary, a deacon of Rome. Divines generally seem to admit its worth and weight to be equal, whether it be ascribed to Ambrose or Hilary. The deacons of that day had risen greatly in the principal churches, and had become eminent. The cause was this: the deacons had the principal management of the goods of the church. The churches had become very rich, even before Constantine's time. The

* See Stillingfleet's Irenicum, pp. 381, 382.

number of deacons was limited to seven, in the church of Rome; and this while the presbyters amounted to more than seven times seven. The deacons, therefore, had much power and influence. Some of them were among the most able and learned men of the age. Athanasius was *only a deacon*, while he was one of the *most celebrated champions* for the faith in the great council of *Nice*. Ambrose then, or Hilary, says, "AFTER churches were constituted in every place, and officers appointed, things BEGAN to be arranged DIFFERENTLY from what they were in the *beginning;* for at the *first*, all taught, and all baptized. But if all had continued to be allowed to perform the same things, it would have been absurd, and the ministry would have become vile and contemptible. The apostles' writings are NOT altogether *agreeable* to the *order* of things as NOW *practised* in the church. For Timothy, who was ordained a presbyter by Paul, he calls a bishop; because the *first* or *chief presbyters*, were called bishops." His words are, "*Primi presbyteri episcopi appellatantur.** FIRST or CHIEF PRESBYTERS were called *bishops;* and, as one departed, the NEXT *succeeded* to the *office*. But because the next in succession were sometimes found unworthy to hold the PRIMACY, the CUSTOM was changed by the provision of a council; so that not the next in order, but the next in merit, should be *made bishop*, and CONSTITUTED such BY the *judyment* of a *number* of the PRESBYTERS, lest an unworthy person should usurp, and become a general scandal."† "The *presbyter* and *bishop* had ONE and the SAME ORDINATION. The bishop is the chief among the presbyters—*Episcopus est qui inter presbyteros primus.*"‡ Here it is plainly stated that the usages of the church, in his day, were different from what they were in the apostles' time; and therefore they could only be of *human* authority, and not of divine right. The presbyters and bishops, he says, had "*one* and the SAME ORDINATION."

* Mr. Sinclair (p. 90) chooses to display some wit, and to show his knowledge, by declaring that "*a prime presbyter*, as presiding in the college of presbyters, "is an "*invention* of the *modern* followers of Aerius"—that "this *poetic* personage, this *creature* of the *dissenting imagination*, was *created* by David Blondel." Mr. Sinclair, of course, *talks by hearsay about Ambrose*, otherwise his wit would have been spoiled, and his learning improved.

† Com. in Ephes. cap. 4. ‡ Com. in 1 Tim. iii.

The consecration of bishops, as now used, has no Scriptural authority: it is merely a ceremony. Then he proceeds to say, that a presidency became established. This, at the *first*, took place by mere *seniority*, and one was CONSTITUTED BISHOP BY the *judgment* of the other PRESBYTERS: the PRESBYTERS MADE the BISHOP; and this precedence was given to one presbyter as bishop, for the *honour* of the church and the ministry, and *not* by any *divine right*. Indeed, he says, it was *different* from *apostolic usage*.

We may here introduce the matter of Aerius. I consider it of little importance; and the opinion of Epiphanius about it is much of the same value. Stillingfleet says, "I believe, upon the strictest inquiry, Medina's judgment will prove true, that Hieron, Austin, Ambrose, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophilact, were all of Aerius's judgment as to the *identity of both name and order of bishops and presbyters* in the primitive church; but here lay the *difference:* Aerius from thence proceeded to *separation* from the bishops and their churches, *because* they were bishops."* But then, say the advocates of episcopacy, Epiphanius wrote against his opinion, and numbered Aerius among heretics because of it. As to Aerius's views, we have heard Stillingfleet's opinion. They who say he was accounted a heretic solely for maintaining that bishops and presbyters were, according to the Scriptures, the *same*, do not know what they say. Whŏ maintained this more boldly than Jerome? But neither Epiphanius, who was a friend of Jerome's, nor any other person, ever counted Jerome a heretic on this account. Augustine says, "Aerius maintained that a *bishop* could NOT ordain. He opposed the existence of the *distinction* between a bishop and presbyter: he rejected it: he also fell into the HERESY of the ARIANS, &c.†" And as to Epiphanius, whatever he was besides, he was a *hot headed meddling bigot*. He quarrelled with John, bishop of Jerusalem; and ordained in John's diocess without his leave. He collected a council in Cyprus to condemn Origen's Works, and wrote to Chrysostom to do the same thing. Chrysostom refused. Epiphanius had the temerity to enter Constantinople, Chrysostom's see, in order to cause

* Iren., p. 276. † Vid. Augustini de Heresibus, No. 53.

the decree of Cyprus against Origen to be put in execution there. Before he entered the city, he ordained a deacon in one of Chrysostom's churches. He refused to hold communion with Chrysostom himself: threatened that he would, *publicly*, in *the church*, at Constantinople, with a loud voice, condemn Origen, and all who defended him. He came to the church, but being warned by Chrysostom that he might expose himself to danger from the people, he desisted. He tried to persuade the empress that God would spare the life of her son, (who was then dangerously ill,) if she would only persecute the defenders of Origen. He defended praying for the dead: Aerius opposed it. So he put Aerius into the list of heretics. Bishop Taylor himself says, 'He that considers the catalogues [of heresies] as they are collected by Epiphanius, &c., shall find that many are reckoned for heretics for opinions in matters disputable, and undetermined, and of no consequence; and that in these catalogues of heretics there are men numbered for heretics, which by every side respectively are acquitted, so that there is no company of men in the world that admit these catalogues as good records, or sufficient sentences of condemnation."* And Dr. Cave, an unexceptionable authority with high Churchmen, says, "He [Epiphanius] was one of no great judgment and reasoning; he generally took his account of things upon trust, suffering himself to be imposed upon by those narratives which the several parties had published of the proceedings, either of their own or of their adversaries' side, without due search and examination, which ran him upon *infinite mistakes, inconsistencies*, and *confusion*."†

Chrysostom, who flourished A. D. 400, says, "Paul, speaking about bishops and their ordination, what they ought to possess, and from what they must abstain, having omitted [1 Tim. iii] the order of presbyters, he passes on to that of deacons. Why so, I ask? because the *difference* between the bishop and the presbyter is ALMOST NOTHING. For the PRESIDENCY of the churches is committed to *presbyters*, and the QUALIFICATIONS which the apostle requires in a *bishop*, he requires in a *presbyter* also: being *above them* SOLELY by their *ordination*, and this is the

* Lib. of Prophes., sec. 2. Dupin, Biblioth Patrum. cent. 4th.
† Dr. John Edwards' Pratrologia p. 53, ed. 1731, 8vo.

ONLY *thing* they, the bishops, SEEM to have more than presbyters." * This last remark refers to what is supposed to be the *sheet anchor* of episcopacy, in the modern sense, that is, the *power of ordination.* † Chrysostom says they were the SAME in every thing else. Even as to ordination he only mentions the FACT of the difference, and *not* the divine right. And as to the fact, his language is by no means decided. Jerome also himself has a remark of a similar kind in his Epistle to Evagrius: "What *does* the bishop which the presbyter *may not do*, except ordination?" The interpretation of the one may be sufficient for the interpretation of the other. Jerome, then, it should be remembered, does, in that Epistle, *most plainly* declare that bishops and presbyters are the SAME. He then says, that "*after* the apostles' time, one *presbyter* was placed over the rest *as a remedy against schism.* For at Alexandria, from the evangelist Mark up to Heraclas and Dionysius, the bishops, (about A. D. 250) the PRESBYTERS ALWAYS ELECTED one from among themselves, and placed him in the *higher chair*, and they, the presbyters, gave him the name of bishop: in the *same manner* as an army may make its general; or *as deacons* elect one of themselves whose industry they know, and call him archdeacon. For what *does* a bishop do," (that is, now he means about A. D. 400,) "*except ordination*, which a presbyter *may* not do?" Here then, it is evident, that Jerome speaks simply of the fact and *custom* which had THEN, in *his day*, become established, as to what bishops do, and presbyters *may not* do: not of

* Com. in 1 Tim. iii.

† There is a *radical absurdity* at the bottom of all their mighty pretensions about the *power of ordination.* It is as plain as that two and two make four, that the greater always includes the less. Now the two *sacraments* of baptism and the Lord's supper are the greatest ritual ordinances in the Christian church. A *sacrament* is, by all divines, considered above all other ritual ordinances. Ordination is NOT a *sacrament.* It is therefore *less* than a *sacrament.* He that has power and *authority* to perform the *greater*, has power and authority to perform the less. *All presbyters*, by the confession of our opponents, have power and authority to administer the *sacraments* of *baptism* and the *Lord's supper*, the greater: *all presbyters*, therefore, have power and authority to administer *ordination*, the *less.* This, to a reasonable mind, would settle the whole question; but as the *prejudices* of some people are so strong as to take away the force of clear reason, we have met the opponents on their own ground.

the *power* or *right* of presbyters, or that they could not by divine right do what the bishops did. This *custom*, or ecclesiastical arrangement, which, for the *honour* of the bishop and the church, made ordination generally a prerogative of the bishop's office, Jerome advises the presbytery to comply with. Therefore "they MAY *not*," because of this custom, especially without the bishop's license, ordain. Any other supposition would make Jerome contradict, in the same page, what he had most firmly maintained. His illustrations show the same. The *custom* of the church at Alexandria was evidently intended by him as an example of *ordination by presbyters:* else why mention it as something which *had* CEASED, in his day, to be *common*. The *presbyters*, at Alexandria, prior to A. D. 250, elected one of themselves, placed him in the chair, *(all the consecration* he had)—and gave him his title of *bishop*. It is trifling to say, as Episcopalians do, 'Perhaps there were bishops present who laid on hands and consecrated him.' This is little short of contradicting Jerome. He certainly makes the presbyters the doers of all that was done in making the bishop. The case of the army making its general is another instance which he mentions in illustration of his position. Every schoolboy knows that the Roman *army* in those days frequently created their generals by *acclamation;* and it is to these proceedings Jerome alludes: the *lawfulness* of the thing was no more necessary to his *argument*, than the *lawfulness* of the *unjust steward's* conduct to our *Lord's argument*. It is the *fact*, and its *bearing*, which are important. The *deacons*, too, then appointed *one of themselves* as their *head*, calling him *archdeacon:* so the *presbyters make a presbyter* their head, and call him *bishop*. The army made the general: the deacons the archdeacons; and the PRESBYTERS MADE THE BISHOP. This is plainly the sense. PRESBYTERS, then, ORDAINED even BISHOPS, in the see of Alexandria, from the time of St. Mark up to Heraclas and Dionysius, that is, for about the first two hundred years after Christ. What need be clearer than that Jerome's exception only regards the CUSTOM of the church in *his day*, (about one hundred and fifty years after what he refers to at Alexandria,) and not the *power* or *right* of the presbyters to *ordain*. Stillingfleet has moreover quoted, in confirmation of this view, the testi-

mony of Eutychius, the patriarch of Alexandria, who expressly affirms, "that the twelve presbyters constituted by Mark, upon the vacancy of the see did choose of their number one to be head over the rest, and the *other eleven* did *lay* THEIR *hands upon* him, and blessed him, and MADE him patriarch," or bishop.* The *manner* it seems *varied*, the *thing* was the *same*. There NEVER was any *universally* established *manner* of *making bishops* in the Christian church, excepting the Scriptural one, by which every man is made a minister and a bishop at once, by one and the same ordination. Chrysostom's language is similar to Jerome's, and admits the same interpretation. He positively says, that the bishop had then nothing above presbyters but ordination; and speaks *doubtingly* as to this: "This [ordination] is the *only* thing they SEEM to have more than presbyters." But even were he to speak with the utmost certainty, his language only states the *fact* and *not* the *law*. It was the fact, I believe, generally, in Chrysostom's days, for the HONOUR of the bishop and the church, and (as they supposed) to prevent divisions, that bishops only ordained bishops. This is perfectly consistent with all we have said to show the identity of bishops and presbyters by divine right. However, Calderwood, Alt. Damascen. p. 160, shows that a more accurate translation of Chrysostom's language will give a very different view of his meaning: the latter member of his sentence, correctly translated, being as follows:—"The bishop being above the presbyter solely by their" (the presbyters') "suffrage; and by this alone they seem to assume an *unjust* superiority over the presbyters." This proves that Chrysostom considered bishops and presbyters to be really and by divine right the same in all things, and taxes the bishops with abusing the power given them by the suffrage of the presbyters, injuriously to depress those very presbyters.

The questions on the Old and New Testament, found in the Works of St. Augustine, are mostly quoted as his by Episcopal writers: they could not find fault with me, therefore, if I claim their authority as his authority. However, it is supposed they were written by a more ancient author than Augustine. In quest. 101, while rebuking some deacons who put themselves before the presbyters,

* Stillingfleet's Iren., p. 274.

he says, "The superior order contains the inferior; for a presbyter may perform the office of a deacon, an exorcist, or a reader. *By a presbyter you must understand a bishop;* as Paul the apostle proves, when instructing Timothy, whom he ordained *a presbyter*, what sort of a person he ought to be whom he was to ordain a bishop. For what is a bishop but the first presbyter, that is, the highest priest? Finally, he addresses such as fellow-presbyters, fellow-priests. But does the bishop ever address the deacons as fellow-deacons? No indeed; and the reason is because they are so much inferior.—For in Alexandria, and *through the whole of Egypt*, the presbyter consecrates [that is, confirms] when the bishop is not present." Here Timothy is a presbyter: he *as a presbyter* ORDAINS BISHOPS. St. Paul is said to mean a bishop when he speaks of a presbyter; and presbyters also perform confirmation, in the bishop's absence, "*through the whole of Egypt.*"

That presbyters both possessed and exercised the right of ordaining ministers in the primitive church, appears moreover by the thirteenth canon of the council of Ancyra, A. D. 315:—"It is not allowed to *village bishops* to ORDAIN *presbyters* or deacons; NOR is it allowed EVEN to CITY PRESBYTERS to do this in ANOTHER *diocess* WITHOUT the *license* of the *bishop.*" High Church Episcopalians declare they cannot understand this canon! It must be imperfect, or corrupt, or I know not what. So Socinians treat the Scriptures when they are plainly opposed to their schemes. However, no man who understands the GREEK *text* of the canon will deny that the above is a fair translation. Here, then, in the first place, the *chor-episcopi*, or *country bishops*, are utterly *forbid* to *ordain*, and are evidently treated AS INFERIOR to *city presbyters*. Now Bishop Taylor, and many other learned Episcopalians, *fully admit* that these *chor-episcopi*, or village bishops, had, by divine right, the POWER to ORDAIN. Therefore the POWER of the *city* PRESBYTER to ORDAIN presbyters and deacons, is *clearly* supposed in the canon; and is NOT *taken away*, but *only limited* in its exercise. He was *not* to ordain "in *another* bishop's diocess *without* his license:" very proper; but then it is as clear as though the canon had said so, that the city presbyter might and did ordain presbyters and deacons in the diocess of *his own* bishop; and might

do the same in any *other* diocess *by the license* of the bishop of that diocess. It seems they had been guilty of the irregularity referred to in the canon. However, there is no limitation as to the diocess where they reside; though the rules of order would require such things to be done with the consent of the bishop. Here, then, is another triumphant proof of the power of presbyters to ordain.

There is considerable evidence arising to the same point from the illustrious council of Nice, A. D. 325, which condemned Arianism, and so greatly promoted the establishment of the orthodox faith on the doctrine of the Trinity. A bishop, they say, was to be constituted by bishops. But in their epistle to the church of Alexandria, and the other churches of Egypt, they seem to speak of presbyters as still frequently ordaining presbyters. They are speaking of the clergy who had not gone away in the division with Meletius. Their words are :—"But as for those who, by the grace of God, and your prayers, have been found in no schism, but have ever remained immaculate in the Catholic Church, it pleased the holy synod that they should have *power* to ORDAIN, and give up the names of such as were worthy to be the clergy; and in short, to do all things according to the ecclesiastical law and sanction."* The synod *took away* this power from all the Meletian clergy who had made division; but as to those of the clergy of Alexandria, and the other churches of Egypt, who had not, they *allowed* their *power* of *ordaining*, &c., to REMAIN. Valesius thinks Christophorson is mistaken in applying this passage to *presbyters;* but Valesius's reasons do not invalidate Christophorson's view. For even as to those from whom this power of ordaining was taken away, the Epistle says, they were to "*continue possessed* of their DIGNITY and OFFICE, but yet they were to acknowledge themselves always *inferior* to all *those* that had been approved of in every DIOCESS and church, and who had been ordained before by our dearest colleague in the sacred function, Alexander." Now how could BISHOPS *retain* their HONOUR and *office*, in the SAME DIOCESS, while OTHER BISHOPS OVER THEM had the *sole* honour and office of bishops in those diocesses? This is absurd. It

* Socrat. Eccles. Hist., lib. 1, c. 9.

remains, therefore, that they spake of presbyters. *These presbyters*, their language shows, both *possessed* and *exercised* the *power* of ORDAINING *presbyters* and *deacons;* though at *that time* they direct that *bishops* should ordain *bishops*.

The regulations about ordination in the Christian church appear to have been chiefly derived from the regulations of the Jewish synagogue. To make this plain, we will here repeat the statement of those Jewish regulations as given by Maimonides, and will add a few remarks upon them. "In ancient times," says he, (that is, the times before Hillel the elder, who died about ten years after the birth of Christ,) "every one who was ordained himself, ordained his scholars. But the wise men, in order to show particular reverence for Hillel the elder, made a rule that no one should be ordained without the permission of the president, neither should the president ordain any one without the presence of the father of the sanhedrim, nor the father without the presence of the president. But, as to other members of the sanhedrim, *any one might ordain*, (having obtained permission of the president,) by joining with himself two others; for ordination cannot regularly be performed except three join in the ordination."* "In the ancient times" of the church, "any one who was ordained himself, ordained others:" the presbyters ordained Timothy, and each church "was ruled by the presbyters in common." Then, probably, about the middle of the second century, one presbyter was elected by the rest to preside in the presbytery, and over the general acts of the church. This presiding presbyter was, for distinction's sake, called bishop: a term which up to that time had been *common* to all the presbyters, but which henceforward became appropriated to this presiding presbyter. For the honour of this bishop, or president, "a rule was made that no one should be ordained without his permission," neither could he regularly ordain without the permission of the presbyters, as is most clearly proved by many examples in Cyprian himself, who apologized for ordaining a reader or subdeacon without their permission, even at the time when the rage of his enemies made it unsafe for him personally to consult them. With the per-

* Vid Selden de Synod., lib. 2, c. vii, p. 173, 4to. Amstel., 1679.

mission of the bishop, however, the presbyters continued to ordain, as occasion required, for the first three hundred years: see the proof of this in the language of Firmilian, the celebrated bishop of Cesarea, in Cappadocia, and the decisions of the councils of Ancyra and Nice, in the preceding pages. At Alexandria, it seems that the custom for the presbyters there to ordain their president or bishop continued until A. D. 250, as Jerome testifies. But the power and authority of the bishops gradually increased by their uniting to support each other; by the pride and ambition of many of them, (for the fathers themselves give abundant evidence of this,) and by their pleas that submission to their authority was essential to prevent schisms, and to the peace of the church. They ventured at length in the council of Nice, not indeed to prohibit presbyters from ordaining presbyters, but to make a law that *bishops* ALONE should *ordain bishops*. Of course, as the council was principally made up of bishops, there would not be any opposition. Yet Ambrose expressly declares that the bishops and presbyters had "one ordination," that is, *really* such; as the consecration of bishops is only a ceremony. Such is the origin, and such is the history of episcopal ordinations. Presbyters still unite with bishops in ordaining presbyters in the Church of England, though bishops alone ordain bishops. If this be used as a matter of *prudential* arrangement by a particular branch of the Christian church, it may be justified on the principle that such *nonessential* things may be left to the discretion of each church to determine; but when it becomes urged as *divine law:* when, upon this principle, the ministers of churches who use no such episcopal ordinations, are declared to be NO ministers, and all their ordinances VAIN: here the whole question is altered altogether: the peace of the Christian world at large is broken: the ministers and people of all other churches are insulted: a monstrous system of spiritual tyranny is introduced; and a many-headed Popery is established upon this shallow pretence of the SOLE authority of bishops by *divine right*.

That bishops ordaining or consecrating bishops is a *nonessential*, demonstrably follows from the proofs that have been given in these pages, that the order of bishops itself is a mere matter of ecclesiastical arrangement, and

has no divine right. At first they were made merely by the election of their fellow-presbyters, as in the church of Alexandria, for nearly two hundred years. Then it seems some ceremony was used in placing them in the *higher chair* or *throne*, as it was called; so the term for it came to be ENTHRONIZATION. Yet so far was it from impressing any *indelible character*, as they call it; or conferring, as an act, extraordinary powers, forming a distinct order, that this enthronization or consecration was frequently *repeated*, when an individual was removed from one bishopric to another. So, for instance, Socrates.* speaking of Miletius, who first had been bishop of Sebastia, afterward of Berœa, but after this was sent for by the inhabitants of Antioch to be their bishop, says that here, at Antioch, another, a third *enthronization*, was performed. Many cases of a similar character might be given. And, indeed, that the consecration of bishops was not considered at the Reformation to be, like ordination, *incapable of repetition*, will be evident from the fact, that many bishops were then consecrated *anew* when translated to other bishopries; as may be seen by the instances and the words given from the registers, in Courayer on English Ordinations.† The Oxford Tract-men have a little outwitted themselves in publishing Archbishop Cranmer's translation of Justice Jonas's "Sermon on Apostolical Succession and the Power of the Keys," as containing the "mature and deliberate judgment" of Cranmer on these subjects. For, after speaking of ordination as performed by the apostles upon others for "*the ministration of God's word*," he adds, "And THIS was the *consecration*, orders, and unction of the apostles, whereby they, at the beginning, made bishops and priests, and this shall continue in the church even to the world's end. And whatsoever rite or ceremony hath been *added more* than this, cometh of *man's ordinance* and policy, and is not commanded by God's word." Now Cranmer, we shall see, in the next section, distinctly maintained that bishops and priests were, by the law of God, the same. Here he says that that consecration, orders, and unction whereby the apostles appointed individuals to the ministration of God's word, was the only real ordination they

* Eccles. Hist., part ii, chap. 44.

† Page 65, English translation, London, 1725, 8vo.

had; for "whatsoever rite or ceremony had been *added* more than this, cometh of *man's ordinance* and policy, and is *not* commanded by *God's* word." "Cranmer and Barlow," says Courayer, "affirm that the *consecration* [of a bishop] is *not necessary*, and that the designation [or appointing to the office] is sufficient."*

We wish to study brevity; otherwise it would be easy to show at length the same point, viz., that the ordination or consecration of bishops, as distinct from their ordination as presbyters, has nothing in it but *a mere human ceremony* of appointing an individual to some specific duties in the church. The word of God has not a syllable upon it; therefore it is utterly void of DIVINE authority. There is not a particle of genuine evidence upon it for the *first hundred years* after Christ. It never had, in any age, any thing that *essentially* distinguished it from the ordination of a presbyter. This is abundantly evident from Morinus's celebrated work on Ordinations. There it is shown, that in every thing but imposition of hands, different churches and different ages have varied from each other; and, in most of the matters, have varied without end. Now that cannot be essential to a thing which sometimes does not exist with it at all; and this is the case with every thing belonging to the consecration of bishops, excepting imposition of hands; and even this, in some cases, was *not* used. Imposition of hands is *common* to the ordination of a presbyter as well as to that of a bishop: it cannot be *common* to both, and yet *essentially* DISTINGUISH the one from the other: there is nothing, therefore, in the consecration of a bishop, nor ever was, that *essentially* distinguished it from the ordination of a presbyter. If it be pleaded that the church has appointed *words* to be used at this consecration to distinguish it from that of a presbyter, we grant it. But then the church never had any authority from *Scripture* to do more in this than to make it a prudential ecclesiastical arrangement. The reformers of the Church of England did not even appoint any words for the act of consecration to *distinguish* the office of a bishop from that of a presbyter: the words that now distinguish them were *added* in *later* times.

* P. 147; and see Burnet's Ref., vol. i, Record, No. 21.

If, then, the consecration of bishops is a *mere human* ceremony, it is impossible that the act of bishops, *as bishops*, in ordination, can have any *divine* efficacy or authority above that of presbyters. Bishops may ordain one another for ever, but this would never change the matter. *A cipher multiplied by a cipher always produces a cipher.* All the authority, then, that bishops have to ordain men to the ministration of God's word and sacraments, arises from their authority *as presbyters*, and from THIS ALONE. Scores of bishops in the Romish Church never were presbyters; yet these men have ordained presbyters and bishops in the church without number. Through these our high Churchmen have received their boasted orders. Such is their vaunted "*unbroken series* of VALID *ordinations*," and apostolical succession!

The tenacity of high Churchmen to their exclusive and intolerant scheme must be my apology to the reader for the length of this section. We will now state the result of the inquiry:—

1. No clear evidence appears that any of the fathers of *the first three centuries*, or any council, ever maintained this high Church doctrine of the *divine right of bishops* ALONE to be *successors* of the apostles, and to ORDAIN and GOVERN pastors as well as people.

2. No DISTINCTION appears between the office of presbyter and bishop in the Epistle of Clemens Romanus, nor in the Epistle of Polycarp, the most ancient and genuine pieces we have in the first century.

3. In the second and following centuries, a CUSTOM GRADUALLY becomes established for one *presbyter* to be placed over the others; and the term bishop, or superintendent, becomes appropriated to him alone.

4. The ancients assign, as the REASON for this arrangement, the *honour* of the church—the *peace* of the church—the *prevention of schisms* or *divisions*—and the *unity of the whole*. So Tertullian, Cyprian, Hilary or Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome.

5. PRESBYTERS PRESIDED over the church: in some places it would seem chiefly; but even where a superintendency had taken place, they appear with the bishop, as sitting to *rule in common* with him; and without them he could not do any thing of importance in the church. So

Ignatius, Tertullian, Justin Martyr, Origen, Cyprian, Cornelius, Firmilian, and Jerome.

6. PRESBYTERS ORDAINED. This is, as to the *fact*, proved by Firmilian, the celebrated bishop of Cesarea, in Cappadocia; by the *custom* of the church of *Alexandria* for the first two hundred years after Christ; by the testimony of Jerome and Eutychius; and by the council of Ancyra, and the council of Nice. The right of power also necessarily follows from their being the same order as bishops.

7. Presbyters are the SUCCESSORS of the *apostles:* this is distinctly stated by Ignatius, Irenæus, and Jerome. We have not yet given a most striking passage of Jerome on this point. Hear him then: "Do you approach to the CLERGY?—God forbid that I should speak disparagingly of the CLERGY: *they* are SUCCESSORS to the DEGREE OF APOSTLES,—*qui apostolico gradui succedentes.*" And, after mentioning the difficulties and dangers of their station, he says, "*Non est facile stare loco Pauli; tenere gradum Petri.*"—"It is no easy matter to stand in the *place of Paul*, nor in the *degree of Peter.*"*

8. The ONLY *true* and *indispensable succession* to the apostles is the *succession* of FAITH, and *not* of *persons:* Irenæus, Tertullian, and Ambrose. This last bishop says, "They have *not* the *succession of Peter*, who have *not* the *faith* of Peter."†

The conclusion is, then, that in the purest Christian antiquity, *bishops and presbyters were, by divine right*, THE SAME: "all the difference which existed, in fact, between them was almost nothing;" and was merely by *custom*, or the *use of the church*, as a *prudential measure*, to promote order, peace, and unity. *Ordination* by presbyters, and all other acts of presbyters, are, by *divine right*, EQUALLY VALID with those of *bishops:* the *succession* of FAITH is the only true succession. Ministers and churches who do not hold this—who *adulterate it*—are to be FORSAKEN; and *those* ALONE received as TRULY *apostolical* successors, ministers, ordinances, and churches, *where this* FAITH is preached *as the apostles preached it*, and as they left it to us in the SACRED SCRIPTURES as their *last* will and *testament, sealed* as with their *oath*, and their *blood*. Let the

* Epist. ad Heliodorum de Vita Eremetica. † De Penitentia.

semi-popish divines, allowed improperly in the Church of England, and the thorough-going Papists of our country, look about them. *Their* succession is NOT *the succession of the apostles*, NOR of the EARLIEST FATHERS; but a *fabrication* of their own, based upon *false assumptions*, and built up by *bigotry and intolerance*, out of human *traditions*, *forged authorities*, and *abominable idolatries*. See section x of this Essay.

APPENDIX TO SECTION VI.

ON THE *ECCLESIASTICAL* ACCOUNT OF THE BISHOPS OF THE SEVEN CHURCHES MENTIONED IN THE REVELATION; AND ON THE SUPPOSED DIFFICULTY OF ACCOUNTING FOR THE EXISTENCE OF EPISCOPACY AT *SO EARLY* AN AGE OF THE CHURCH.

THERE are two points which Episcopal writers consider of much importance in this controversy, and which we have not yet introduced. They might chronologically have been introduced sooner; but the reader will here examine them with greater advantage, after the preceding discussion: they are,

1. As to what are called the bishops of the seven churches of Asia, mentioned in the Revelation of St. John; and,

2. The supposed difficulty of accounting for the existence of episcopacy at so early an age of the church, except on the principle that it is *jure divino*, established by divine right.

First, then, as to what are called the bishops of the seven churches of Asia, mentioned in the Revelation of St. John. As most of the difficulty upon both these points arises from the *ambiguity of the words* bishop or episcopus, and episcopacy, let it be premised that there are *three* different senses in which these words are used in this controversy. As to the word bishop:—this word is used in the New Testament, 1. As synonymous with the word presbyter: "*the names are common:*" see pages 87–90 of this Essay: 2. Somewhere in the second or third century the word bishop was applied to *distinguish* the primus presbyter, appointed by the suffrages of the other presbyters, and by ecclesiastical arrangement, as superintendent

of ministers and people: 3. High Churchmen use it for an order of ministers claiming powers and authority incompatible with the office of presbyters. Now we grant there were bishops in the seven churches of Asia in the *first* sense; but we deny that there is any solid proof of their existence, in the *second* sense, in these seven churches. Clemens Romanus, who, according to the best authority, wrote A. D. 96 to the church at Corinth, (comparatively in the neighborhood,) mentions not a syllable about a primus presbyter as superintendent over the presbyters. Presbyters, according to Clemens, then "*ruled the church in common.*" The Revelation is supposed to have been written only four years after this time. As to bishops in the *third* sense, high Church bishops, we utterly deny that there is any evidence of any such bishops in the seven churches. Even the corrupted epistles of Ignatius would not sustain the authority of high Church bishops, for *presbyters* are there made EQUAL *to the apostles:* are they so with high Church bishops? Nay, so far from this, Bishop Taylor maintains that bishops ONLY are properly *pastors*, § 25: *doctors*, or teachers, § 26; and *priests*, § 27; so that, on this scheme, poor presbyters are only a sort of *tolerated* pastors, *existing by the leave* of the bishops: see § 9 of his Episcopacy Asserted. As to *tradition*, on this question *there is none that can be surely depended upon.* Take, for instance, the case of Timothy's being bishop of Ephesus. There is absolutely none that gives him the *rights and authority* of a high Church bishop. But, passing the question of the *kind* of episcopacy, for a moment, is there any *satisfactory* proof of the *fact*, that Timothy was bishop of Ephesus, one of these seven churches? I unhesitatingly answer, *There is not:* see page 61 of this Essay. Dr. Whitby grants, "that he can find *nothing* on this subject in any writer of the *first three centuries.*" But then he says "this defect is abundantly supplied by the concurrent suffrage of the fourth and fifth centuries." Well, let us see. He refers to Eusebius first, and very properly; for succeeding authors generally took their reports from him. If the *fountain* fails us, the streams must fail too. Now Eusebius honestly confesses, that though he made it a main point, in writing his history of the early ages of the church, to inquire into such matters, yet all was dark, and

he "could *nowhere* find so much as the *bare steps* of any who had passed that path of inquiry before him," excepting something like "*a torch here and there afar off.*" Then, speaking of Paul and Peter, and the churches founded by them, he says, "Now how many, and what sincere followers of them have been approved as sufficient to take the charge of those churches by them founded, is *not* easy to say, *except such and so many as may be collected from the words of St. Paul.*" Does this sort of evidence abundantly supply the defect of the *total silence of the first three centuries?* And nothing better is to be found. Eusebius says, "Timothy *is reported* to have been the first that was chosen to the bishopric of the Ephesian church." He gives *no authority:* which he always does when he has it. The report is evidently only guess-work, in its origin, having arisen from St. Paul's mentioning his name in connection with Ephesus; but see page 61 of this Essay. The stories in ecclesiastical history about the early bishops and founders of churches are generally full of confusion and contradiction: they are mostly the inventions of a later age. See section x. But were we to grant these statements (confusion as they are) to be true, they never make the powers and authority to be those of high Church bishops: the preceding discussion has abundantly shown this. The result, then, of this investigation of ecclesiastical authority, and of tradition on this point, is, that there were bishops in the seven churches of Asia; for bishops and presbyters are spoken of by Clemens Romanus, the best authority on the subject, as one and the same; that there is no clear evidence of a superintendency, in the seven churches, of a primus presbyter as over ministers and people; and that, as to high Church bishops, it would be a burlesque to compare them with the bishops of the seven churches, and of Clemens Romanus.

Secondly, let us consider the supposed difficulty of accounting for the existence of episcopacy at so early an age of the church, except on the principle that it is *jure divino* —established by divine right. Here we must remember the distinction above made, as to the different meanings of the word bishop: the same applies to the word episcopacy. 1. We grant a SCRIPTURAL episcopacy by divine right, in which bishops and presbyters are *identical:*

2. We grant an *ecclesiastical* arrangement of superintendency, otherwise called episcopacy: 3. We grant a USURPATION of powers and authority claimed for bishops by divine right, otherwise also called episcopacy. Now we have no difficulty in accounting for the *first*, or *Scriptural* episcopacy. The *second* also is easily accounted for, as is shown from Jerome, &c., in the preceding pages. The *third* kind, viz., high Church episcopacy, had *no existence* in the early ages of the church: we have not to account, therefore, *for what did not exist.*

SECTION VII.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AT THE REFORMATION AGAINST THESE CLAIMS.

I KNOW it would be in vain for me to attempt to persuade many Church people that I am not writing against the Church of England. They mean the Church as necessarily implying a *divine order of bishops, &c. I mean the Church, according to the principles of the* REFORMERS.* They mean the church with all its state importance, its wealth, its emolument, &c. The question of Church and State, in the abstract, is a matter of indifference to me; and I think it is indifferent also in the eye of the Scriptures. At the utmost, however, the connection of a church with the state is only a *circumstance:* it is not essential to the existence of the church. The church is *spiritual.* The church is, under God, founded on its *doctrines, discipline, and ordinances;* on the *faith* and the *piety* of its members. In this light I view the Church of England. Taking the church of England in this view on the question before us, as constituted at the Reformation, I write

* Froude, a leader among the Oxford Tract-men, says, "Really *I hate the Reformation* and the *reformers* more and more."—"Why do you praise Ridley? Do you know sufficient good about him to counterbalance the fact that he was the associate of Cranmer, Peter Martyr, and Bucer? As far as I have gone, too, I think better than I was prepared to do of Bonner and Gardiner."—*Froude's Remains.* Very consistent!

not a sentence to oppose it, but daily pray for the blessing of God upon it, and upon all other Christian Churches. Taking the words as frequently used by bigoted Churchmen, I utterly deny the truth and Scriptural character of their claims and pretensions: I believe them to be semi-popery, and necessarily leading to bigotry, intolerance, and persecution. Believing, as I do, that this is the nature and tendency of these claims, I think myself bound in conscience to put away all flattering titles as to any men or order of men, and to speak as plainly and powerfully as I can to the overthrow of this system from its foundation. *Amicus Socrates, Amicus Plato, sed magis Amicus veritas:* —Socrates is my friend, Plato is my friend, but Truth is my friend above all friends.

Having come through the Scriptural view, and the view of the fathers, on the identity of bishops and presbyters, we proceed to show that the ENGLISH REFORMERS maintained that bishops and presbyters are, by *divine right*, the *same* ORDER; if this be proved, the whole system of high Church succession men falls to the ground. For if presbyters be, by divine right, the same order as bishops, then their spiritual power and authority are the same: all their ordinations are equal to episcopal ordinations: the ministry and ordinances of all the other Protestant churches in Great Britain, and on the continent, as being administered by presbyters, are equally Scriptural with those of any modern Episcopal church: consequently all these EXCLUSIVE and arrogant high Church claims for episcopal ordinations, &c., will vanish before the light and power of truth. Bigotry will lose its support, and intolerance its plea for persecution. Christian truth and Christian liberty will extend their hallowing influences over the whole land. Then shall the heathen and the infidel exclaim, "See how these Christians love one another!"

WICKLIFFE, who is called the morning star of the Reformation, says, "*I boldly assert* one thing, viz., that in the primitive church, or in the time of St. Paul, two orders of the clergy were sufficient, that is, a priest and a deacon. In like manner *I* affirm, that in the time of Paul the presbyter and the bishop were names of the *same office*. This appears from the third chapter of the First Epistle to Timothy, and in the first chapter of the Epistle to Titus.

And the same is testified by that profound theologian Jerome."*

But to come to *those* who actually *formed* the Articles, the *Book* of ORDERS, and the plan of the government of the Church of England. We shall give every reader the opportunity of seeing, with his own eyes, the truth of the matter, by extracts from original documents, as published by Bishop Burnet in his History of the Reformation. They appear to be the determinations of a convocation of archbishops, bishops, and divines; for *Cromwell, the king's vicar general, signs first*, as presiding over the convocation. As these writers use the expressions "deacons *or* ministers, priests *or* bishops," it is hardly necessary to say to the most cursory reader, that they mean the same office by each of the terms in the separate clauses, "deacon *or* minister: priests *or* bishops." Bishop Burnet observes, "Another thing is that both in *this writing*, and in the *Necessary Erudition* of a Christian Man, *bishops* and *priests* are spoken of AS ONE *and* THE SAME OFFICE." *Priest*, by these reformers, everywhere means *presbyter*.

Bishop Burnet's remarks on the nature and value of these documents, shall now introduce them. He says, "After some of the sheets of this History were wrought off, I met with manuscripts of *great authority*, out of which I have collected several particulars, that give a *clear light* to the proceedings in those times.—I shall here add them," "In this writing, bishops and priests are spoken of as *one* and the SAME OFFICE. It had been the *common* style of that *age*," says he, "to reckon bishops and priests as the *same office*."

Here follow extracts from the document called "A Declaration made of the Functions and *Divine Institution of Bishops and Priests.* An Original."

"As touching the sacraments of the *holy orders*, we will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge,"

"First,—How that Christ and his apostles did institute and ordain in the New Testament—*certain ministers* or officers, which should have *spiritual power, authority* and

* Wickliffe's Trialogus, as quoted by Vaughan in his excellent Life of Wickliffe, vol. ii, p. 275, ed. 1831, Lond.

commission under Christ, to preach, &c., and to ORDER and consecrate *others* in the same room, order, and office, whereunto they be called and admitted themselves; and finally to feed Christ's people like good pastors and rectors," &c.

"Item: That this office, this ministration, this power and authority, is no tyrannical power, having no certain laws or limits within the which it ought to be contained, nor yet none absolute power, but it is a moderate *power*, subject, *determined*, and *restrained* unto those *certain* LIMITS and ENDS for the which the same was appointed by God's ordinance:—it appeareth that the same was a *limited power and office ordained especially* and *only* for the *causes and purposes* before rehearsed."

"Item: That *this office*, *this power* and *authority*, was *committed* and given *by Christ* and *his apostles* unto certain persons only, that is to say, unto PRIESTS *or* BISHOPS, whom they did elect, call, and admit thereunto by their prayer and imposition of their hands."

"Secondly,—The invisible gift of grace conferred in this sacrament is nothing else but the power, the offices, and the authority before mentioned: the visible and outward sign is the prayer and imposition of the bishop's hands, upon the person which receiveth the said gift of grace. And to the intent the church of Christ should never be destitute of such ministers as should have and execute the said power of the keys, it was also ordained and commanded by the apostles, that the same sacrament should be applied and ministered by the bishop from time to time, unto such other persons as had the *qualities*, which the apostles *very diligently descryve* [describe;] as it appeareth evidently in the third chapter of the First Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, and his Epistle unto Titus. And surely this is the whole virtue and efficacy, and the cause also of the institution of this sacrament, as it is found in the New Testament; for albeit the holy fathers of the church which succeeded the apostles, minding to beautifie and ornate the church of Christ with all those things which were commendable in the temple of the Jews, did devise not only certain other ceremonies than be before rehearsed, as tonsures, rasures, unctions, and such other observances to be used in the administration of the said

sacraments, but did also institute certain inferiour orders or degrees, janitors, lectors, exorcists, acolits and subdeacons, and deputed to every one of those certain offices to execute in the church, wherein they followed undoubtedly the example and rites used in the Old Testament; YET THE TRUTH IS, that in the *New Testament* there is *no mention* made of *any* DEGREES or *distinctions* in ORDERS, but *only* of deacons *or* ministers, and of PRIESTS *or* BISHOPS; NOR is there any word spoken of any other ceremony used in the conferring of this sacrament, but only of prayer, and the imposition of the bishop's hands."

"Thomas (Ld.) Cromwell, (*the King's Vicar General.*)
T. Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury.
Edward, Archbishop of York.
John, Bishop of London.
Cuthbert, Bishop of Durham.
John, Bishop of Lincoln.
John, Bishop of Bath.
Thomas, Bishop of Ely.
John, Bishop of Bangor.
Nicholas, Bishop of Salisbury.
Edward, Bishop of Hereford.
Hugo, Bishop of Worcester.
John, Bishop of Rochester.
Richard, Bishop of Chichester.
Richard Wolman.
John Bell.
William Cliffe.
Robert Aldridge.
Geoffrey Downes.
John Skip.
Cuthbert Marshall.
Marmaduke Waldeby.
Robert Oking.
Nicholas Heyth.
Ralph Bradford.
Richard Smith.
Simon Matthew.
John Prynn.
William Buckmastre.
William Maye.
Nicholas Wotton.
Richard Cox.
John Edmonds.
Thomas Robertson.
Thomas Baret.
John Nase.
John Barbar.

(Some other hands there are that cannot be read,) doctors of *laws* and doctors of *divinity*."*

Here the reader sees the Church of England solemnly declare, in convocation, that bishops and presbyters are *one* and the *same office*. Their "*power, authority*, and commission under Christ," are made EQUAL; in which is expressly laid down their equal power, authority, and commission "to ORDER [*ordain*] and consecrate others in the same room, order, and office, whereunto they be called and admitted themselves." This is their solemn view of the "*divine institution of bishops and presbyters.*" What then can the reader think of those divines of this Church who deny that bishops and presbyters are, by *divine right*,

* Burnet's History of the Reformation, Collection of Records, B. 3, Add. No. 5.

according to the *true* Church of England, *one* and the *same* [illegible]; and deny also that *ordination* by presbyters is, by *divine institution*, EQUAL to *ordination* by bishops? If any should pretend that the doctrine of this Church has been *altered* since the time above referred to, let him show *when* and *where:* let him produce the *documents* published by the Church, met in *solemn convocation rescinding* or *repealing* the *above*, and AS PLAINLY *declaring* the *order* of bishops to be by *divine institution superior* to, and *incompatible* with, the *office of presbyters* as such; and that *such bishops* ALONE have "power, authority, and commission, under Christ, to *order* and *consecrate* others in the *same room*, *order*, and *stead*, whereunto they be called and admitted themselves." Nothing short of this will avail. They know they cannot do it.

The date of the above document Burnet shows to be 1537 or 1538. In Burnet's account of the drawing up of a "Declaration of the Christian Doctrine for Necessary Erudition of a Christian Man," he remarks, that the convocation books are lost; but that Fuller, his only guide, "assures the world that *he copies* out of the *records with his own hand* what he published." Now Fuller calls the assembly of bishops, &c., that drew up this declaration a convocation. Burnet has a little doubt of the correctness of this statement. But all he says is easily reconcilable with it. It would be out of all rule to allow trifles to set aside the statement made by a grave divine, declaring to the world that "he copies out of the records with his own hand." The assembly, then, was a convocation. This point is thus decided by Dr. Laurence: "Before its publication it was *approved* by the *convocation* then sitting, in which it was *examined in parts*, as appears evident from the Minutes of that assembly, in Wilkins's Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ, vol. iii, p. 868."* The work thus drawn up, examined, and approved by the convocation, "The Necessary Erudition of a Christian Man," was published by *royal authority*, and hence also usually called the King's Book. No determinations in the Church of England can have higher authority. In the chapter of orders, they "expressly resolve that *priests and bishops, by God's law*, are *one and the same;* and that the POWER of ORDINATION

* Dr. Laurence's Bampton Lectures, p. 191.

and excommunication belongs EQUALLY TO BOTH."* What can be more decisive! Comment would darken this clear statement; and to multiply words would be to dilute and weaken its force.

The following are extracts from their decisions individually.

CRANMER, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.—"The *bishops* and *priests* were at one time, and were *no two things;* but BOTH ONE OFFICE in the beginning of Christ's religion."

BISHOP OF LONDON.—"I think the bishops were first; and yet I think it is *not of importance*, whether the PRIEST then MADE the BISHOP, or the *bishop* the *priest:* considering after the sentence of Jerome, that in the beginning of the church there was none (or *if* it were, *very small*) difference between a bishop and a priest, *especially* touching the SIGNIFICATION."

DR. ROBERTSON.—"I do not think it absurd that a priest should consecrate a bishop, if a bishop cannot be had."

DR. COX.—"Although by Scripture, (as St. Hierome saith,) priests and bishops be one, and therefore the one not before the other; yet bishops, *as* they be NOW, were AFTER priests; and therefore MADE OF (*by*) PRIESTS."

DR. REDMAYNE.—"They all be of like beginning, and at the beginning were BOTH ONE, as St. Hierome and other old authors show by the Scriptures, wherefore *one made another indifferently.*" Burnet says that Dr. Redmayne "was esteemed the *most learned* and *judicious* divine of that time." When the convocation "were about to state the true notion of faith, Cranmer commanded Dr. Redmayne, who was esteemed the most learned and judicious divine of that time, to write a short treatise on these heads: which he did with that solidity and clearness, that it will

* Calamy's Defence of Nonconformity, vol. i, p. 91, ed. 1703. This is the substance of that chapter, given in the words of Calamy. Its words in the Necessary Erudition are such as the following: "Of two orders only, that is to say, priests and deacons, *scripture* maketh express mention." Here presbyters and bishops are both one order. "*All* lawful *powers* and *authorities* of one bishop *over another* were to be given to them by the consent or ordinance, and positive *laws of men only*, and NOT by any ordinance of God in Holy Scripture." Then speaking of ministers of the gospel in general as successors of the apostles, they say that "Christ set them ALL indifferently, and in LIKE *power, dignity* and *authority.*"

sufficiently justify any advantageous character that can be given of the author."

Here we find not only the most express statements that the reformers of the Church of England believed "bishops and presbyters to be *one* and the *same office*," but that PRESBYTERS MADE, that is, ORDAINED BISHOPS, and bishops presbyters, indifferently.

The reader is now prepared to see through another common mistake. The Book for Ordaining Priests and Bishops is appealed to in proof that the Church of England maintains that bishops and presbyters are not, by divine institution, *one* and the *same office*. Now the principal bishops and divines who composed the Book of Ordination in King Edward's time, were the same as those whose views on the divine institution of bishops and priests have been given above, and whose decisions in solemn convocation, ratified by royal authority, we have just heard. This book, the Book of Orders, was put forth in the time of King Edward VI. Cranmer, and most of the other compilers, outlived him. The interpretation, therefore, of this book, as then put forth, which would go to maintain episcopacy as by divine right to have powers and authority incompatible with priests or presbyters, as such, would be to assert that these eminent men determined one thing in solemn convocation, and then immediately put forth a book contradicting their former determination, without ever giving any intimation of such a change in their views!

Two parts of the Book of Ordination are appealed to by these writers for the purpose of maintaining the superiority of episcopacy by divine right: the part of the office for ordaining a bishop, as distinct from that part of the office for ordaining a presbyter; and the preface to the book itself.

First, then, as to the part of the office for ordaining or consecrating a bishop: let the reader keep in mind, that the question is not whether the English reformers made a class of ministers called archbishops and bishops, distinct from priests or presbyters: no one denies this; but the question is, did they do this on the principle of the *divine right* of the order of bishops, as distinct from, superior to, and incompatible with presbyters as presbyters; or did they do it as an *ecclesiastical arrangement*, for the honour of the bishops and the church; for order, peace, unity, and

good government? They have *solemnly answered* for themselves, that "by DIVINE INSTITUTION," bishops and presbyters were *one* and the *same* office; therefore they meant the distinction above referred to *merely* as an *ecclesiastical* arrangement according to the views of the Christian fathers, for the purpose just now specified. This is further evident from a fact of which many readers are not aware: it is this, that in the *original book*, and up to the time of Charles II., there was NO DIFFERENCE in the *words* of ORDAINING *a bishop*, to DISTINGUISH *his office* from that of a *presbyter*. Bishop Burnet grants "there was then *no express mention* made in the words of ordaining them, that it was for the *one* or the *other* office." It cannot be denied: the old form is standing evidence of the fact. In the time of King Charles II., about 1662, the bishops who had the care of *revising* the *ordination service*, after these words, "Receive the Holy Ghost,"—ADDED, with regard to *priests*,—"for the OFFICE and work of a PRIEST, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands:"—and, with respect to the *bishop*, "for the office and work of a *bishop* in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And in the interrogatories put to the bishop elect, there is ONE ADDED, not anciently used, namely, this: "Will you be faithful in ORDAINING, sending, or laying hands upon others?" with this answer—"I will so be by the help of God." Moreover those passages of the New Testament that speak so expressly on the duties of a *Scriptural bishop*, were made part of the OFFICE of *ordaining* a priest or *presbyter*, and continued so until 1662. The form of ordaining a presbyter commenced with the *epistle*, as it is termed, out of Acts xx, 17–35; or in its place, 1 Tim. iii, entire. The reader will do well to read the places. Then for the *gospel*,—the commission given by our Lord to his ministers, as in Matt. xxviii, 18, and other passages out of John, chapter x, and xx. Now these passages *thus applied* to *presbyters*, in the solemn act of setting them apart to their office, clearly show that the Book of Orders, up to 1662, bore solemn testimony to their being, by *divine right*, *Scriptural bishops;* and the VERY COMMISSION (Matt. xxviii, 18) about which high Churchmen make such a parade as belonging SOLELY to *bishops* as a

distinct order, superior to, and incompatible with presbyters simply as such—*this very commission* is, in this *solemn act*, given by the reformers to *presbyters* ALONE, and is *never* applied to bishops as such, in any part of their ordination. In the revision of 1662 these scriptures were *omitted* in the form of ordaining a *presbyter*, and were generally *transferred* to the form of consecrating a *bishop*. There was, indeed, in the old form of the consecration of a bishop, very little *Scripture* employed. The reformers, it is clear, looked upon it only as a decent *ceremony*, but as having *no Scriptural authority*, nor conferring any additional *divine* authority.* The changes in 1662 may be thought to show the *wishes* of some of the parties concerned; but still they do not alter any *principle* in the old form. All the alterations consist in *detail* and *arrangement*.

The reformers of the Church of England, also, *appointed presbyters* to perform the *imposition of hands* in *ordaining presbyters*, along with bishops. So directs the Book of Ordaining Priests, &c.: "When this prayer is done, the bishop, WITH THE PRIESTS present, shall *lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth the order of priesthood:* the receivers humbly kneeling upon their knees, and the bishop saying, Receive the Holy Ghost," &c. As the reformers believed that bishops and presbyters were, by the Scripture, one and the same office, *this ordination* was, in their view, the ONLY *real Scriptural ordination* constituting any person a *minister* of God's word. *Presbyters* then are *actually ordainers* in ALL the *Scriptural ordinations* that ever have taken place *in the Church of England*. Several acts of parliament have ratified the ordination of such as were ordained by *presbyters only*. Thus in the 13th of Elizabeth, cap. 12—"An act for the ministers of the Church to be of sound religion. That the churches of the queen's majesty's dominions may be served with pastors of sound religion, Be it enacted, that every person under the degree of bishop, which doth or shall pretend to be a priest, or minister of God's holy word and sacrament, by reason of any other form of institution, consecration or ordering, [*ordaining*,] than the form set forth by parliament, shall declare his assent and subscribe the articles," and on these conditions he shall retain orders

* Vide Burnet's Records, book 3, No. 21, quest. 10–14.

and benefice. So in the 12th Caroli, cap. 17—"Be it enacted, that any ecclesiastical person or minister, being ordained by any ecclesiastical persons, &c., shall be, and is hereby declared, adjudged, and enacted to have been, be and continue the real and lawful incumbent, parson, rector, vicar and possessor of the said ecclesiastical benefice, livings and promotions respectively to all intents and purposes whatever." By these acts, *hundreds of ministers* who had *no more than presbyterian ordination*, or *ordination by presbyters alone* without the *presence* of any *bishop*, were *confirmed* in their livings as true ministers in the Church of England. See a license also to this effect by Archbishop Grindal, "approving and ratifying the form of ordination," by a Scotch *presbytery*, of Mr. Morrison, a Scots divine; and giving him commission "throughout the whole diocess of Canterbury, to celebrate divine offices, to minister sacraments," &c.* "No bishop in Scotland, during my stay in that kingdom," saith Burnet, bishop of Sarum, "ever did so much as *desire* any of the *presbyterians* to be *reordained*."† Bishop Cosin, speaking of the presbyterian ordination of the French churches, says, "If at any time a minister so ordained in these French churches came to incorporate himself in *ours*, and to receive a public charge, or cure of souls among us, in the Church of England, (as I have known some of them to have so done of late, and can instance in many other before my time,) *our bishop did not reordain him* before they admitted him to his charge; as they must have done, if his former ordination in France had been void. Nor did our *laws require more* of him than to declare his public *consent* to the religion received among us, and to subscribe the articles established." See a letter from Dr. John Cosin, afterward bishop of Durham, to Mr. Cordel, who scrupled to communicate with the French Protestants upon some of the modern pretences, published by Dr. Isaac Basire, archdeacon of Northumberland, in his account of Bishop Cosin, annexed to his funeral sermon, and given as an appendix to "the judgment of the Church of England in the case of lay baptism."‡ It

* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i.

† Bishop of Sarum's Vindication, printed London, 1696, pp. 84, 85, as quoted by Owen in his "Ordination by Presbyters," Introd.

‡ Second edit. London, 1712.

is a curious fact, that anciently incumbents, rectors, &c., were styled PRELATES.* As the constitution of this Church has established an order of men as bishops or superintendents, *requiring* all important matters to be under their superintendency, and that *no ordinations* especially should be performed *without them*, it is right enough to refuse any one regularly to minister in that Church, who positively and *wilfully resists this arrangement*. If this be done *without claiming divine right* for this superintendency, and *without attempting to unchurch other churches because they do not adopt it*, the writer would not say one word against it. Every church has a right to use its own judgment in such matters.

Now for the second point, viz., the preface to the Book of Ordination.

The words in the preface—"It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time, there hath been these orders of ministers in the Christian church: bishops, priests, and deacons"—are the same as they were in King Edward's ordinal, and therefore have the *same interpretation;* for there is nothing declared to the contrary in the revision of 1662. The question here, then, can be only as to the meaning which the reformers attached to the term *order*. Now we have seen that the FATHERS used it for a *distinction* of persons in the church, possessing equal powers, by *divine right*, as gospel ministers. The reformers were familiar with the writings of the fathers. The proper interpretation of their language, then, is, that they mean, that from the apostles' times *such distinctions* as bishops, presbyters, and deacons had existed: NOT that the office or duties of a bishop were by *divine institution incompatible* with the office of a presbyter, as a presbyter; for they expressly affirmed the contrary. The bishop of London, as above quoted, along with Cranmer, intimates that there might be "*some small difference* between a bishop and a priest in the beginning of the church." That some distinction did exist, even in the apostles' time, we do not

* Johnson's Clergyman's Vade Mecum, vol. i, pp. 183, 212, ed. 4th. Bishop Burnet, in the preface to his Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England, shows that several abbots, though no more than *presbyters*, not only wore *the mitre*, but *ordained* even *bishops*.

deny. We only deny that the powers and authority of bishops and presbyters were incompatible with each other as such, by divine right. There is considerable proof, as was shown in section iii, that presbyters were superior in honour and duties to bishops, perhaps *as much so as rectors are to curates;* yet not so as to constitute authority and powers incompatible with the office of bishops. The preface then, contains no proof of bishops, by divine right, as an order such as high Churchmen pretend.

Additional evidence will arise both to the above interpretation of the Book of Orders, and to the general question, by the testimony of Bishop Jewel.* Jewel was bishop in Elizabeth's time, considerably after the publishing of the Book of Ordering Bishops, Priests and Deacons. He stands in the very first class of reformers for talent, piety and learning; and for the ability with which he defended the Church of England against the Papists. "His Apology," says Dr. Randolph, "has had the sanction of public authority, and may therefore be relied on as containing the final and decided opinion of our reformers, approved in the general by the church at large."† The Apology was published in 1562. Harding, a Jesuit, published a Confutation of it. Jewel replied in a Defence of his Apology. This Defence, imbodying the Apology also, was in such universal and high repute, that it was placed in the parish churches to be read by all, as giving the best view of all the matters therein contained, corroborated by the authorities of Scripture, and the fathers of the first six centuries. Many have probably seen this huge folio, fastened with chains to a reading-desk, in the church. The edition from which I quote has a large strong iron plate at the bottom, with a hole through it, where the chain had been formerly fastened. In his Apology, he says, "That the catholic church is the kingdom, the body, and spouse of Christ: that Christ is the

* Richard Hurrel Froude, a first-rate Oxford Tract-man, speaking of this illustrious writer, says, "Jewel was what you, [the Oxford Tract-men,] in these days, call an irreverent Dissenter. His Defence of his Apology disgusted me more than almost any work I ever read. He laughs at the apostolical succession, both in principle and as a fact: and says that the only succession worth having is the succession of DOCTRINE."—*Froude's Remains.*

† Preface to Dr. Randolph's "Enchiridion Theologicum."

only Prince of this kingdom: that there are in the church *divers orders* of ministers: that there are some who are deacons, others who are presbyters, and others who are bishops, to whom the instruction of the people, and the care and management of religion, are committed." Part ii, sec. 6. Now here is the *distinction* of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, called "*divers orders.*" Does this great writer, and champion of the Church of England, then, mean that bishops are an order, by *divine right*, with powers and authority incompatible with presbyters, as such? Let him explain himself in his Defence. Harding, it seems, for the sake of cavilling, had introduced the question of the difference between priests and bishops, or "the distinction of a bishop and a priest," as he himself expresses it. Bishop Jewel says, "Here, to *weigh down* the AUTHORITY of GOD'S HOLY WORD, Mr. Harding hath brought in a heap of ordinary stale quarrels of the difference between priests and bishops; of Lent; of the communion book; of the homilies; of the order of service; and of the *perpetual virginity of our Ladie.* His WHOLE DRIFT herein is to bear us in hand, that there is very little or NO AUTHORITY in the *Scriptures;* and that the WHOLE credit and *certainty* of our FAITH resteth ONLY in the *Church of Rome.* But what means Mr. Harding here to come in with the difference between priests and bishops? Thinketh he that* priests and bishops hold only by TRADITION? Or is it so horrible a heresy as he maketh it, to say that *by the Scriptures* of God, a *bishop* and a *priest* are ALL ONE? Or knoweth he how far, and unto whom he reacheth the name of heretic? Verily Chrysostom saith, 'Between a bishop and a priest *in a manner there is no difference.*' St. Hierome saith, somewhat in rougher sort, 'I hear say there is one become *so peevish*, that he setteth deacons before *priests*, that is to say, *before bishops;* whereas the apostle plainly teaches us, that *priests and*

*Jewel does not here mean the distinction only, but the things themselves also; for his (Harding's) whole drift, and the *whole drift of Popery,* is, "to bear us in hand that there is very little or no *authority* in the *Scriptures;* and that the *whole* credit and certainty of our *faith* resteth only in the *Church of Rome*"—a remark which no Protestant should ever forget. To accomplish this, some of their greatest men have exerted all their learning and ingenuity.

bishops be ALL ONE.' Augustine saith, 'What is a bishop but the first priest,—that is, the highest priest?' So saith St. Ambrose, 'There is but *one consecration* of priests and bishops; for *both* of them are *priests*, but the *bishop* is the *first*.' All these, and other more holy fathers, TOGETHER WITH ST. PAUL the apostle, for THUS SAYING, by Mr. Harding's advice, must be holden for heretics."* He thus quotes Augustine in another place: "Augustine saith 'the office of a bishop is above the office of a priest,' (*not by authority of the Scriptures*, but) after the names of honour which the CUSTOM of the church hath now obtained," p. 100. The words "*not by authority of Scripture*," are Jewel's own words, put in to explain Augustine's sense. Jewel, we see, perfectly *agrees* with Cranmer, and the rest of the bishops and divines who formed the Constitution, Government, and Book of Ordination, of the Church of England. He believes "bishops and presbyters, *by the Scriptures of God*, are ALL ONE;" that, as Augustine saith, "the office of a bishop is *above* the office of a priest, (NOT by *authority* of the *Scriptures*, but) after the *names of honour* which the CUSTOM of the church hath obtained." His mention, as we have seen, in the Apology, of "*divers orders*, deacons, presbyters, and bishops," does not imply that the order of bishops has, by "authority of Scripture," prerogatives incompatible with presbyters, but that, while by the Scriptures, as to rights and authority, they are one, yet they are there distinct names, and that the bishop is the first priest or presbyter, and above the other presbyters by the *names of honour* which the CUSTOM of the church hath obtained. So meant the reformers, and so means the ordination service.

Dr. Whitaker, who lived in the time of Queen Elizabeth, was a profoundly learned divine of the Church of England, and a mighty champion of the Reformation against Popery. He says, "I confess that there was originally no difference between a presbyter and a bishop. Luther, and the other heroes of the Reformation, were presbyters, even according to the ordination of the Romish Church; and, therefore, they were, *jure divino*, bishops. Consequently, whatever belongs to bishops, belongs also, *jure divino*, to themselves. As for bishops being afterward placed over pres-

* Page 202, fol. ed., 1609.

byters, that was A HUMAN arrangement for the removal of schisms, as the histories of the times testify."*

Hooker appears to maintain the very same view in his fifth book of Ecclesiastical Polity, a work of the very highest authority with the Church of England, and for its reasoning, its language, and its learning, the admiration of all. The sixth, seventh, and eighth books are of NO AUTHORITY: they were not published by himself, and are acknowledged to have been altered much by other hands; so that no confidence whatever can be placed in them as Hooker's. In the fifth book, sec. 78, he says, "Touching the ministry of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the WHOLE *body* of the church being *divided* into *laity* and CLERGY, the clergy are EITHER *presbyters* or *deacons*." Now where are bishops? nowhere, except they be one and the same as presbyters. Nothing can be plainer. "For of *presbyters, some were greater, some less* in power, and that by our Saviour's own appointment: the *greater*, they which received fulness of spiritual power, and the *less*, they to whom less was granted." Let the reader carefully attend, and he will see that by the *greater* presbyters he means the first apostles endowed with power of miracles, &c., and by the *less* or *inferior presbyters*, he means *all other* ordinary Christian *ministers*, without distinction. He goes on: "The apostles' peculiar charge was to publish the gospel of Christ unto ALL *nations*, and to deliver them his ordinances received by *immediate revelation. Which pre-eminence excepted*, to ALL other offices and duties incident to their" (that is, the apostles') "order, it was in them to *ordaine* and consecrate whomsoever they thought meet, *even as* our Saviour did himself assign seventy others of his own disciples *inferior presbyters*, whose *commission* to preach and baptize was the *same* which the apostles had." Here, then, ALL are *inferior presbyters, except* the *twelve apostles*, who received greater fulness of spiritual power, and delivered ordinances by *immediate revelation;* and, which pre-eminence excepted, to ALL *other* OFFICES and DUTIES incident to the order of the twelve apostles, ALL the *inferior presbyters* were ordained and consecrated by the apostles. "To these *two degrees*" (as above mentioned) "appointed of our Lord and Saviour Christ, his

* Whitakeri Opp., vol. i, pp. 509 et 510, Genev., 1610, fol.

apostles soon after annexed *deacons*."—"It appeareth, therefore, how long these *three* degrees of ecclesiastical order have continued in the church of Christ," (1.) "the *highest* and largest, that which the *apostles*," (2.) "the *next*, that which the *presbyters*," (3.) "the *lowest*, that which *deacons* had."—"*Evangelists were presbyters*, of principal sufficiency."—"Pastors, what other were they than presbyters also?"—"I beseech them, therefore, which have hitherto *troubled the church* with questions about *degrees* and *offices* of *ecclesiastical* calling, because they principally ground themselves upon two places, (1Cor. xii, 28: Ephes. iv, 7–12,) that *all partiality* laid aside, they would sincerely weigh and examine whether they have not misinterpreted both places, and all by *surmising* INCOMPATIBLE *offices* where nothing is meant but sundry graces, gifts, and abilities which Christ bestowed."—"It clearly appeareth, that *churches* APOSTOLIKE did know but *three* degrees in the power of ecclesiastical order, at the first, (1.) '*Apostles*,' (2.) '*Presbyters*,' and (3.) '*Deacons;*' AFTERWARD, *instead of apostles*, *bishops*, concerning whose order we are to speak in the seventh book." This he never published. But he has clearly given his judgment that presbyters and bishops, in "*apostolic churches*," were one and the same order and office. ALL the *ordinary powers and offices of apostles*, he affirms, belong to *all* gospel ministers, whom he calls, COMPARED *with the twelve apostles*, "*inferior* presbyters." The powers of *ordination* were among those powers, and therefore belong equally to them all, by divine right, whether bishops or presbyters. They were all one and the same in "APOSTOLIKE CHURCHES." Bishops, as superintendents over other ministers, were NOT, according to Hooker, in the apostolike churches: they arose *afterward*.

Hooker's design was not to establish the DIVINE RIGHT of episcopacy, but to oppose the *exclusive* claim for the divine right of presbyterianism; and to show that the ceremonies and discipline of the Church of England were *lawful*, that is, NOT *antiscriptural, not sinful*. Accordingly we find him, in the third book of his celebrated work, actually and ably reasoning *against* the *exclusive divine right* of any special form of church government: "We must note," says he, "that he which affirmeth speech to

be necessary among all men throughout the world, doth not thereby import that all men must necessarily speak one kind of language: even so the necessity of polity and regiment in all churches may be held, without holding any *one certain form* to be *necessary* in them all."—"The general principles [of Scripture] are such as do *not* particularly prescribe any one, but sundry may equally be consonant unto the general axiomes of the Scripture."—"We reckon matters of government in the number of things *accessary, not* things necessary."—"But as for those things that are accessary, those things that so belong to the way of salvation, as to *alter* them, is no otherwise to change that way, than a path is changed by altering only the uppermost face thereof, which be it laid with *gravel*, or set with *grass*, or paved with *stones*, remaineth still the *same* path; in such things because descretion may teach the church what is convenient, we hold not the church further tyed herein unto Scripture, than that *against* Scripture nothing be admitted in the church, lest that path which ought always to be kept even, do thereby become to be overgrown with brambles and thorns."—"I therefore conclude, that neither God's being author of laws for government of his church, nor his committing them unto Scripture, is reason sufficient, wherefore all churches should for ever be bound to keep them without change." This surely is sufficient to destroy for ever the claims of high Churchmen to the authority of Hooker in favour of their *exclusive* system. Hooker did not deny that presbyterianism was a valid form of church government, but he denied its *exclusive* validity; and maintained that episcopacy, when adopted by the church, was equally valid. So also the 36th Article:—"The Book of Consecration of Archbishops, &c., doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering; neither hath it *any thing*, that of itself is *superstitious* and UNGODLY." Many of the Puritans and rigid Presbyterians denied this; and were *utterly opposed* to an *order of bishops at all*, even as a human arrangement, as *perpetual governors of ministers* as well as of *people*. This arose from what they had seen of it in Popery, and in some who abused it in their day. Though Popery did not maintain the *divine right* of bishops, yet the *pope* gave them rights, power, and jurisdiction; and the *bishops*, in return,

took a *solemn oath* to be FAITHFUL to the POPE: they JOINED THEIR AUTHORITY to *rivet the chains of priestly tyranny* and bondage upon the church. The name of bishop, therefore, as well as that of pope, had generally become *hateful* at the Reformation and afterward.

As the documentary evidence in this section has been considered highly valuable, the reader probably will not regret the insertion of an extract from Dr. Field's work "Of the Church." Dr. Field was a learned divine of the Church of England in the days of Queen Elizabeth, and of James I. Mr. Palmer has pronounced his work to be profoundly learned. It is highly valued; and is both very scarce and very dear, so that but few readers can have access to it. This learned defender of the Church of England thus speaks on the subject of the identity of bishops and presbyters:—"But they will say, whatsoever may be thought of these places wherein bishops did ordain, yet in many other none but presbyters did impose hands: all which ordinations are clearly void; and so, by consequence, many of the pretended reformed churches, as namely those of France, and others, have no ministry at all. The next thing, therefore, to be examined is, whether the *power of ordination* be so *essentially* annexed to the order of *bishops*, that none but bishops may in any case ordain. For the clearing whereof we must observe, that the whole ecclesiastical power is aptly divided into the power of order, and jurisdiction. *Ordo est rerum parium disparium que unicuique sua loca tribuens congrua dispositio:* that is,—*Order is an apt disposing of things, whereof some are greater and some lesser, some better and some meaner, sorting them accordingly into their several ranks and places.* First, therefore, order doth signify that mutual reference or relation, that things sorted into their several ranks and places, have between themselves. Secondly, that standing, which each thing obtaineth, in that it is better or worse, greater or lesser than another, and so accordingly sorted and placed, above or below other, in the orderly disposition of things. The power of holy or ecclesiastical order is nothing else but that power which is specially given to men sanctified and set apart from others, to perform certain sacred supernatural and eminent actions, which others of another rank may not at all, or not ordi-

narily meddle with. As to preach the word, administer the sacraments, and the like.

"The next kind of ecclesiastical power is that of jurisdiction. For the more distinct and full understanding whereof we must note, that three things are implied in the calling of ecclesiastical ministers. First, an election, choice, or designment of persons fit for so high and excellent employment. Secondly, the consecrating of them, and giving them power and authority to intermeddle with things pertaining to the service of God, to perform eminent acts of gracious efficacy, and admirable force, tending to the procuring of the eternal good of the sons of men, and to yield unto them whom Christ hath redeemed with his most precious blood, all the comfortable means, assurances, and helps that may set forward their eternal salvation. Thirdly, the assigning and dividing out to each man, thus sanctified to so excellent a work, that portion of God's people which he is to take care of, who must be directed by him in things that pertain to the hope of eternal salvation. This particular assignation giveth, to them that had only the power of order before, the power of jurisdiction also over the persons of men.

"Thus, then, it is necessary that the people of God be sorted into several portions, and the sheep of Christ divided into several flocks, for the more orderly guiding of them, and yielding to them the means, assurances, and helps that may set them forward in the way of eternal life; and that several men be severally and specially assigned to take the care and oversight of several flocks and portions of God's people. The apostles of Christ and their successors, when they planted the churches, so divided the people of God converted by their ministry, into particular churches, that each city and the places near adjoining did make but one church. Now because the unity and peace of each particular church of God, and flock of his sheep, dependeth on the unity of the pastor, and yet the necessities of the many duties that are to be performed in churches of so large extent, require more ecclesiastical ministers than one; therefore though there be *many presbyters*, that is, many *fatherly guides* of one church, yet there is one among the rest that is specially pastor of the place, who, *for distinction sake, is named a bishop;* to whom an

eminent and *peerelesse* power is given, for *the avoiding of schisms* and factions; and the rest are but assistants and coadjutors, and named by the general name of presbyters. So that in the performance of the acts of ecclesiastical ministry, when he is present, and will do them himself, they must give place; and in his absence, or when being present he needeth assistance, they may do nothing without his consent and liking. Yea so far, *for order sake*, is he preferred before the rest, that some things are specially reserved to him only, as the *ordaining* of such as should assist him in the work of his ministry, the reconciling of penitents, confirmation of such as were baptized, by imposition of hands, dedication of churches, and such like.

"These being the diverse sorts and kinds of ecclesiastical power, it will easily appear to all them that enter into the due consideration thereof, that the *power* of ecclesiastical or *sacred order*, that is, the *power* and *authority* to intermeddle with things pertaining to the service of God, and to perform eminent acts of gracious efficacy, tending to the procuring of the eternal good of the sons of men, is EQUAL and the SAME in ALL those whom we call presbyters, that is, *fatherly guides* of God's church and people; and that ONLY *for order sake*, and the preservation of peace, there is *a limitation* of the *use* and exercise of the same. Hereunto agree all the best learned among the Romanists themselves, freely confessing that that, wherein a bishop excelleth a presbyter, is NOT a distinct and *higher order*, or power of order, but a kind of dignity and office, or employment only. Which they prove, because a presbyter ordained *per saltum*, that never was consecrated or ordained deacon, may notwithstanding do all those acts that pertain to the deacons order; (because the higher order doth always imply in it the lower and inferior, in an eminent and excellent sort.) But *a bishop ordained per saltum*, that *never had the ordination of a presbyter*, can neither consecrate and administer the sacrament of the Lord's body, nor *ordain a presbyter*, himself being none, nor do any act peculiarly pertaining to presbyters. Whereby it is most evident, that that wherein a bishop excelleth a presbyter, is NOT *a distinct power* of ORDER, but an eminency and dignity only, specially *yielded* to one above all the rest of the same rank, *for order sake*, and to preserve

the *unity* and *peace* of the church. Hence it followeth, that many things which in some cases presbyters may lawfully do, are peculiarly reserved unto bishops, as *Hierome* noteth: *Potius an honorem sacerdotii, quàm ad legis necessitatem — Rather for the honour of their ministry, than the necessity of any law.* And therefore we read, that presbyters, in some places, and at sometimes did impose hands, and *confirm* such as were baptized: which when *Gregory*, bishop of *Rome*, would wholly have forbidden, there was so great exception taken to him for it, that he left it free again. And who knoweth not, that all presbyters, in cases of necessity, may absolve and reconcile penitents: a thing in ordinary course appropriated unto bishops? and why not by the same reason *ordain* presbyters and deacons in the cases of like necessity? For, seeing the *cause why* they are forbidden to do these acts, is, because to bishops *ordinarily* the care of all churches is committed, and to them in all reason the ordination of such as must serve in the church pertaineth, that have the chief care of the church, and have churches wherein to employ them: which only bishops have as long as they retain their standing; and not presbyters, being but assistants to bishops in their churches. If they become enemies to God and true religion, in case of such necessity, as the care and government of the church is devolved to the presbyters remaining catholick, and being of a better spirit; *so the duty of ordaining* such as are to assist or succeed them in the work of the ministry *pertains to them likewise.* For if the *power* of *order* and *authority* to intermeddle in things pertaining to God's service be the same in all presbyters, and that they be *limited* in the *execution* of it, ONLY *for orders sake*, so that in case of necessity, every of them may baptize and confirm them whom they have baptized, absolve and reconcile penitents, and do all those other acts which regularly are appropriated unto the bishop alone, there is no reason to be given, but that in case of necessity, wherein all bishops were extinguished by death, or being fallen into heresy, should refuse to ordain any to serve God in his true worship, but that presbyters, as they may do all other acts, whatsoever special challenge bishops in ordinary course make unto them, might do this also. *Who then dare condemn all those worthy ministers of God*

that were ordained by presbyters in sundry churches of the world, at such times as bishops in those parts where they lived, opposed themselves against the truth of God, and persecuted such as professed it.

"But *seeing bishops and presbyters are in the power of order the same;* as when the bishops of a whole church or country fall from the faith, or consent to them that so do, the care of the church is devolved to the presbyters remaining catholick; and as in the case of necessity they may do all other things regularly reserved to bishops only, (as *Ambrose* showeth, that the presbyters of *Egypt* were permitted in some cases to *confirm* the baptized, which thing also *Gregorie* after him durst not condemn,) so in case of general defect of the bishops of a whole country, refusing to *ordain* any but such as shall consent to their heresies, where there appeareth no hope of remedy or help from other parts of the church, that presbyters may choose out one among themselves to be chief, and so add other to their members by the imposition of his and their hands. This I have proved in my third book out of the authorities of *Armachanus*, and sundry other, of whom *Alexander* of *Hales* speaketh. To which we may add that which *Durandus* hath, where he saith: That *Hierome* seemeth to have been of opinion, that the *highest power of consecration or order*, is the power of a priest or elder. *So that every priest, in respect of his priestly power, may minister all* SACRAMENTS, CONFIRM *the baptized, and give all* ORDERS: howsoever for the avoiding of the peril of schism, it was ordained that one should be chosen to have a pre-eminence above the rest, who was named a bishop, and to whom it was peculiarly reserved to give orders, and to do some such other things. And afterward he saith: That *Hierome* is clearly of this opinion."*

One observation more shall conclude this section. Some may suppose, that if the power of orders, or ordaining does not belong *solely* to bishops, and so constitute them by divine right a superior order, yet that the power of *jurisdiction* does. By jurisdiction is meant the bishop's power of governing and judging both *ministers* and people. As to the fact, the bishops of the Church of England have this power each in his own diocess; but by what *right*

* Dr. Field on the Church, fol. ed., pp. 155–157 and 704. Oxford, 1628.

or *law?* If episcopacy, as a superior order, with the high prerogatives claimed for it, be of *divine right*, *this jurisdiction must* also be of divine right; but if there should be *express acknowledgment* in the constitution of the Church of England that their *jurisdiction* is of merely HUMAN origin, this will be another clear proof that, according to this Church, bishops have, by divine right, none of these prerogatives over presbyters, but are by the Scriptures one and the same office. Whatever views may be entertained as to the Scriptural right of the king of England to be supreme head of the Church, it is certain the Church of England maintains it as a fact; and here we have only to do with FACTS. Now the act of parliament in the twenty-sixth year of Henry VIII. declares that the king "shall have full *power* and *authority* from time to time, *to visit*, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend such *errors*, *heresies*, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, whatsoever they be, *which by any manner of spiritual authority* or *jurisdiction*, ought or may lawfully be reformed." This was in 1535. According to the full power here given, commissions were issued to those who had bishopries, giving them a *license for their jurisdiction as bishops;* and they only held their jurisdiction on good behaviour, and at the king's pleasure. They are as follows:—"Henry the VIII., king of England and France, defender of the faith, lord of Ireland, and, under Christ, supreme head of the Church on earth, to the reverend father in Christ, Edmund, bishop of London, peace, seeing ALL the *authority* of JURISDICTION, and *every kind* of jurisdiction, as well that which is called secular, as that which is called ECCLESIASTICAL, *emanates* primarily from the kingly power as from a supreme head, &c. We, desiring to accede to your humble supplication for this purpose, commit our office and authority to you in the manner and form hereafter described, and declare you to be *licensed* and appointed, therefore, *to ordain to holy orders*, &c. Also to make such *visitations*, &c., as the bishops of London, your predecessors, in past times, might exercise, by the laws of this realm, and *not otherwise*, &c. And to do every thing that in any way concerns episcopal authority and jurisdiction, *over* and *above* those things which are known to be committed unto you by *authority of the Scripture*, in our

stead, name, and authority. Having great confidence in your sound doctrine, purity of conscience, integrity of life, and faithful industry in the performance of your duties, &c., WE LICENSE YOU, by these presents, *during our pleasure*, &c., to answer before us as to your duty, at your bodily peril: admonishing you in the mean time to exercise your office piously, holily, according to the rule of the gospel. and that you never at any time *promote* ANY ONE TO HOLY ORDERS," &c., (that is, otherwise than is here directed.) "In witness whereof we have commanded these presents to be made and confirmed by our seal for ecclesiastical causes. Given November 12th, 1539, and thirty-first year of our reign." Now these *commissions* profess to direct in matters "*besides and beyond* what are known to belong to bishops in the Scripture." What are those matters? The answer is plain as to the meaning of the commission, for it mentions — the ordination of ministers, episcopal visitation, and *jurisdiction* over ministers and people in that diocess. As bishops, none of these things belong to them any more than to any other minister, except by human authority. I am aware Bishop Burnet and others complain of the hardship of these commissions, and say that they were laid aside afterward: this does not in the least alter the question of *law* and *authority*. By 37th Henry VIII., cap. 17, it is enacted and declared,— "That *archbishops*, *bishops*, &c., have NO MANNER of *jurisdiction ecclesiastical*, but by, under, and from his royal majesty." These powers of the sovereign were renewed again as *law* in Edward VI., and in Elizabeth's reign; and *they continue* to be the *law* of the land, as to the Church of England, to the present day.

The conclusion, then, as to the Church of England, is, that the *divine right* of bishops is *no part of its constitution;* but that presbyters and bishops are, by authority of the Scripture, one and the same office; that *presbyters have* EQUAL *divine right* TO ORDAIN; but that, as a *human* arrangement, the order of bishops *is lawful;* and that the Book of Ordination has "all things *necessary* for that purpose; neither hath it any thing of itself *superstitious* or *ungodly*." * All this I believe *ex animo*.

* Dr. Holland, king's professor of divinity at Oxford, says, "That to affirm the office of bishop to be different from that of presbyter and

How lamentable! that any ministers of this Church, forgetting the principles of the reformers, and violating the spirit of the gospel, should weaken Protestantism and strengthen the hands of popery, by insulting all other Protestant ministers as *schismatics:* denouncing their ordinances as the *offerings of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram:* thus destroying the peace of all the Protestant churches in the world! May Heaven soon lead them into more Christian, brotherly, and pacific views! May all Protestant churches unite, on the *basis* of the *Bible*, and in the *spirit* of Christianity, to proclaim a pure gospel, and to bring in the Redeemer's kingdom over all the earth!

SECTION VIII.

BISHOPS AND PRESBYTERS THE SAME ORDER, SHOWN BY THE TESTIMONY OF ALL THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES IN THE WORLD.

To HEAR some high Churchmen talk on this subject, a person would be led to think, that surely all the Christian churches in the world, ancient and modern, must have maintained that bishops are, by *divine right*, a distinct order, with powers and prerogatives of a *very extraordinary* and EXCLUSIVE character. How otherwise could it be, we should suppose, that men pretending to learning should dare to speak so pompously about them, and about the consequences of being blessed with such an order? The only reasonable answer that can be given is, that they do not understand the subject. It has already been shown that the fathers did not maintain such a doctrine: no council ever maintained it; and we now proceed to show that *no Christian church* ever maintained this doctrine.

The *African* church never maintained it; as is clear by the case of the church of Alexandria, which was, at one time, one of the four or five great patriarchates into which the churches in the whole world were divided. Gregory

superior to it, is most false, contrary to Scripture, to the fathers, to the doctrine of the Church of England, yea, to the very schoolmen themselves."—*Dr. Dwight's Theology*, vol. v, p. 184, 8vo.

Nazianzen speaking, in his oration upon Athanasius, about the importance of the see of Alexandria, says, "It is as though you should say that its bishop is bishop of *the whole world*." Tertullian, one of the most illustrious African fathers, teaches most expressly that bishops had no superiority by divine right: Jerome's testimony is decisive, as he lived so near to Egypt, having spent a great part of his life in Palestine.

The *Greek* church never maintained the order of *bishops* by divine right: this is proved from the testimony of Firmilian, bishop of Cesarea; by the council of Ancyra, in the third century; and from the epistle of the council of Nice. Theodoret, also, a Greek father in the fifth century, proves the same, as quoted in section iii. And there is no sufficient evidence, I believe, that the modern Greek church has decided differently from the ancient Greek church.

Let us come to the *Western* church, as it is called, the Christian church in Europe; and this as either included in the *Latin* church, or in those churches that have separated from that church.

The Church of Rome never maintained such an *order of bishops, by divine right*, as our high Churchmen maintain. We have seen the testimony of Jerome and Augustine, whose writings have had greater authority in that church than the writings of all the other fathers besides. Jerome's opinion, nay, his very words, were put into the *canon law*, the ecclesiastical law of that *church:* canon, Olim, dist. 95, et canon, Legimus, dist. 93. And John Semeca, a doctor of the canon law, in his Gloss or Comment on the law: "They say, indeed, that in the *first age* of the primitive church the *names* and *offices* of the bishops and presbyters were *common;* but that in the *second* age of the primitive church, both the names and offices BEGAN to be *distinguished*." The canon, Legimus, dist. 93, contains Jerome's Epistle to Evagrius entire. The first chapter, under dist. 95, is, as we have said, in the *very words* of Jerome, as given at page 97 of this Essay. The sixth chapter is wholly taken from the treatise on the "Seven Degrees" found in Jerome's Works, as mentioned at page 96. It is as follows: "Behold, I declare that presbyters have the power to perform the sacraments, even

while their own bishops are standing at the altar. But, seeing it is written, 'Let the presbyters be honoured with double honour, especially such as labour in the word of God,' it is the duty of presbyters to preach: their blessing edifies the people: *confirmation* by them is suitably performed: it is proper for them to give the communion: it is necessary that they should visit the sick, pray for the weak, and *perform all the sacraments* which God has given. Let none of the bishops, inflated, on this account, with the *envy of a diabolical temptation*, show their wrath in the church, if the presbyters sometimes exhort the people; if they preach in the churches; if, as it is written, they bless the people. To any one that opposes these things, I would say, Let him who forbids the presbyters what God has commanded them, tell me, who is greater than Christ? or what is to be preferred to his body and to his blood? If the presbyter consecrates Christ, when he pronounces the blessing upon the sacrament on the altar of God, is not he worthy to bless the people, who is worthy even to consecrate Christ? It is by your bidding, *O ye most unjust bishops!* that the presbyter, as to the laity and the women, has been deprived of the office of giving God's benediction, —has lost the very use of his tongue—has no confidence to preach—has been *mutilated of every part of his powers and authority*—nothing but the *bare name* of a presbyter is left—the *plenitude and perfection of his consecration are taken away. Is this your honour*, O ye bishops, thus to bring ruin upon the flock? For when by your power you take away from the pastors the privilege of performing with diligence what God has commanded, contagion and destruction spread among the flocks, and you bring evil upon the Lord's inheritance, *while you wish alone to be great* in the church. We read, that, in the beginning, presbyters were *commanded to rule* in the affairs of the church—presbyters were sometimes in the councils of bishops; for *presbyters themselves, as we read, were called bishops:* accordingly it is written to a bishop, 'Neglect not the gift which is in thee by the laying on of my hands;' and, in another place, to presbyters, '(The Holy Ghost,) *who has made you bishops to rule the church of God.*' *But proud bishops hate to have this name given to presbyters:* they do not approve of what Christ approved, who washed

the feet of the disciples—who was baptized by John, though John exclaimed that he needed to be baptized by him. I write these things for this purpose, *that if the* ERROR OF PAST TIME *cannot be remedied*, humility at least may at present be preserved, that presbyters may perform those things in their churches, which are done at Rome, in the East, in Italy, in Crete, in Cyprus, in Africa, in Illyricum, in Spain, in Britain, and even in part of Gaul; and which is done in every place where that humility continues which takes place in heaven, (a matter still higher,) where the seats of angels have their due order." The writer of this Essay expressly disclaims any intention by this quotation to reflect upon all bishops, as unrighteous or tyrannical men. Many bishops, in different ages, have been truly men of God. His chief object in the quotation is to show the views of the Romish Church on the subject of episcopacy by divine right, at the period when this part of the canon law was composed. Episcopacy, in general, is certainly here declared to be an ERROR *of past times;* and bishops, many of them, are spoken of as *usurping tyrants.* Presbyters are spoken of as despoiled by them of the authority and usefulness which, by divine right, truly belonged to presbyters.

Part of the seventh chapter of the council of Hispala, in Spain, in the seventh century, is worth translating:—"It has been reported to us that Agapius, bishop of Cordova, has frequently appointed village bishops (chor-episcopi) or presbyters (*who by the canons are both one*) to consecrate altars and churches without the presence of the bishop. Which, indeed, is not to be wondered at, principally for this reason, that the bishop is a man ignorant of *ecclesiastical* discipline. Therefore it ought to be determined unanimously, that no such license should be used among us, knowing that the appointment and consecration of an altar is not allowed either to a *presbyter or to a village bishop.* For in the sacred Scriptures, the Lord commanded that Moses alone should erect the altar in the tabernacle, that he alone should anoint it, because he was the high priest, as it is written concerning him, 'Moses and Aaron among his priests.' Therefore that which the *head priests* alone might do, of whom Moses and Aaron were types, the *presbyters*, who resemble Aaron's sons, ought not to pre-

sume to seize. For though *in the dispensation* of the *sacred mysteries most things are common* to presbyters and bishops, yet *some* by the *authority* of the *Old Testament*, and *some* by the authority of the *emperor's laws*, and by *ecclesiastical rules*, the presbyters know to be forbidden to them, as the consecration of presbyters, deacons, and virgins, the erection of an altar, the benediction and the unction: seeing it is not permitted to them to give the benediction to the church, nor to consecrate altars, nor to lay on hands in baptism, nor to give the Holy Ghost to such as are converted from heresy, nor to make the unction or holy ointment, nor to sign the forehead of the baptized with the holy ointment, nor even to reconcile a penitent publicly in the time of mass, nor to give recommendatory letters. For all these things are disallowed to presbyters, *because* they are *not* in the *highest part* of the *priesthood*, *which, by the command* of the CANONS, belongs ONLY to *bishops*." Here are distinctions enough, with a witness, between bishops and presbyters. And here is *a true history* of them:—an argument from a type or figure in the Old Testament: ecclesiastical rules; and the emperor's laws. But do these make the distinction to be of *divine right?* The council expressly declares the very reverse, and that it is "*by the command* of the CANONS." Besides, presbyters and chor-episcopi, village bishops, are treated as the same: one law is applied to both. Now Bishop Taylor and others grant that village bishops had the power to ordain, &c., and that such regulations only limit its exercise: the same is true as to presbyters. And the author of the Treatise on the Seven Degrees, above mentioned, gives the same account. He says, "The *ordination* of clergymen, the *consecration* of virgins, the *dedication* of altars, and the preparation of the *chrism*, were reserved to the bishop SOLELY *for the purpose* of giving him authority or honour, lest the discipline of the church, being separated among many, divisions should arise between the ministers, and should produce general scandal. For this cause also the election of bishops has lately been transferred to the metropolitan; and while this high power is given to the metropolitan, the same power is taken away from others; so that the bishops themselves, as high priests, begin to feel *another placed over them;* and this *not* as a matter of *divine*

right, but as a matter of necessity, arising from the nature of the case." Here the ground of the distinction between bishops and presbyters is considered to be the same as that between bishops and archbishops, that is to say, it is merely an *ecclesiastical*, prudential arrangement.

Mr. Johnson, the translator of the canons of the universal church, a strong succession advocate, and a man of great learning, says, "That opinion, that the *order of priests and bishops* was the SAME, *prevailed* in the Church of Rome for *four or five ages* [centuries] *before* the Reformation."* Thus, then, we have the history of the matter in this church up to the Reformation. Jerome determines the point in his day, A. D. 400. The canon law does the same, A. D. 1200. The learned Mr. Johnson, an unexceptionable witness with high Churchmen, settles the point for five hundred years before the Reformation. Bishop Burnet, too, we have seen, says, that at the Reformation it was "the *common style* of that age to reckon bishops and priests the *same office*."

Finally, the council of Trent positively *refused* to acknowledge the doctrine of the order of bishops by *divine right*. They decreed that the *hierarchy* was of *divine right*, and that bishops were in fact above presbyters; but the pope's legates, and all who more especially belonged to the court of Rome, most strenuously opposed the doctrine of *divine right* of bishops. In these matters we only speak to *facts;* and the facts are as above stated, as any one may see by consulting the acts and history of the council.

It perhaps may surprise some, that we so decidedly charge the succession scheme as *semi-popery*, when in the doctrine of the *divine right* of bishops, an essential part of the scheme of our high Church divines, the Church of Rome differs from them. The reader has only to consider, that the same end may be aimed at by different means. This is the case here. We said, in the commencement of this Essay, that these high Church divines, "come forward to effect that in the Protestant church, which Popery endeavours to effect as to the church universal." Their machinery is different. The Popery of Rome created a *one-headed* pope: our high Church divines *try* to create a *many-headed* pope. The Popery of both has one mind—

* Clergyman's Vade Mecum, vol. ii, Pref., p. 54.

bigoted, exclusive, intolerant, and persecuting. *All the jurisdiction of Popery* centres in *the pope*. He *imparts* of HIS FULNESS to the *bishops: they* SWEAR FIDELITY *to the pope*. They support the pope, and the pope supports them; and altogether they unite to bind the church in fetters of iron. Our succession-men place *all authority* by *divine right* in the *bishops*. The bishops, according to this scheme, are to reward them by giving them the *exclusive* right to minister the ordinances of Christ. They are to support each other, in order to form a chain to bind in *Popish* bondage the *Protestant* church, or else to excommunicate from the pale of Christianity such as bend not to their authority. Prevention is better than cure; and it is hoped that this humble effort, under God's blessing, may do something to expose the Popery lying at the root of the scheme it opposes. The authors of the Oxford Tracts for the Times are *English* JESUITS, and aim to accomplish for *Anglican Popery*, what the *Roman Jesuits* do for *Roman Popery*. There is a conspiracy: it is disguised Popery! May Heaven scatter their counsel, and cause the gospel to run and be glorified!

We have shown that the original reformed Church of England gives no sanction to this semi-popish scheme! see section vii.

The *Lutheran* church *never* maintained the divine right of bishops. The archbishop of Cologn joined them, but they never used his episcopal powers to give an order of *jure divino* bishops to their church. They retain the name, in some places, but they have no *jure divino* episcopal ordinations. About 1528, says Haynes, in his translation of Melchoir Adam's Life of Luther, "by the advice of Luther, and by the command of John the Elector, was ordained a *visitation* of the churches of Saxony." In 1528 Luther put forth an "Institution of Visiters." Haynes quotes Luther, saying, "We are visiters, that is, *bishops*, and we find poverty and scarcity everywhere. The Lord send forth workmen into his harvest. Amen." And in another place to Spalatinus, "Our visitation goeth on; of what miseries are we eye witnesses; and how often doe we remember you, when we find the like or greater miseries in that harsh-natured people of Voytland! Let us beseech God to be present with us, and that he would promote the work of his *poore bishops*, who is our best and most faithful *Bishop*

against all the arts and forces of Satan. Amen." And again,—"In our visitation in the territories of Wittemberg, we find as yet all pastors agreeing with their people, but the people not so forward for the word and sacraments." * Again, "Luther wrote thus to Melancthon: 'Concerning *obedience* to be performed to the *bishops*, as in jurisdiction and the common ceremonies, I pray you *have a care*, look to yourself, and give no more than you have, lest ye should be compelled again to a sharper and more dangerous warre for the defence of the gospel. I know that you always except the gospel in those articles; but I fear lest afterward they should accuse us of breach of our covenant, and inconstancy, if we observe not what they please. For they will take our *graunts* in the *large*, *larger*, *largest sense*, and hold their own strictly, and as strictly as they can. In briefe, I wholly dislike this agitation for concord in doctrine, as being a thing utterly impossible, unlesse the pope will abolish his popedom.'" † Luther was *no more* than a *presbyter*, but HE ORDAINED THEIR FIRST BISHOP. "About this time the bishoprick of Neoburg, by Sala, was voyd: there Nicolas Amsdorf, a divine born of a noble family, was‡ *enstalled* by Luther at the command of the elector of Saxony, the patron of that *diocese*; and Julius Pflugius, whom the canons of the colledge chose, was refused. Luther placed him in the *bishoprick* Jan. 20, A. D. 1542. This thing, as many conceived, *gave occasion* to other stirres, and very much offended the emperour, who much affected Pflugius for divers respects. Of this we see more in Amsdorf's Life. After this Luther wrote a book in the German tongue, and call'd it 'The Pattern of the Inauguration of a true Christian Bishop.'" §

"The gospel," says one of the Lutheran articles, "gives to those that are set over the churches a command to teach the gospel, to remit sins, to administer the sacraments, and

* Page 71, 4to. London, 1641. † Pages 83, 84.

‡ Melchoir Adam, in the Life of Amsdorf, mentions this matter as follows: "On the 20th day of January, 1542, the elector Frederic, and J. Ernestus, the brother dukes of Saxony, being present, in the city of Neoburg, by Sala, this noble and unmarried person [Amsdorf] was *ordained bishop by Luther:* Nicolas Medler, the pastor of Neoburg, George Spalatinus, the pastor of Aldenburg, and Wolfgang Steinius, another pastor, *joining* with *Luther* in the *imposition of hands.*"

§ Page 102.

jurisdiction also. And by the confession of all, even our adversaries, 't is manifest, that *this power* is, by *divine right*, *common to all* that are set over the churches, whether they be called pastors, or presbyters, or bishops."

"But one thing made a difference *afterward* between bishops and presbyters, viz., *ordination*, because 't was order'd that one bishop should ordain ministers in several churches; but since *bishops and pastors* are NOT *different degrees by divine right*, 't is *manifest*, that an *ordination*, performed by a pastor in his own church, is valid; and that the common jurisdiction of excommunicating those that are guilty of manifest crimes does belong to all pastors."*

The party of high Churchmen have lately republished a tract of Mr. Charles Leslie, the nonjuror, on episcopacy, in a periodical called "The Voice of the Church." In this tract, Leslie says, the *Lutherans* "*still retain episcopacy.*" Now could such men as Leslie, and can such men as Dr. Hook and the Oxford Tract-men, be ignorant of the principles and facts just stated about the Lutheran church? Can they be ignorant, therefore, that the episcopacy of the Lutheran church, and the episcopacy which they advocate, have little in common but the name; and that these two systems of episcopacy *totally* differ in *all* the great points for which high Churchmen most strenuously contend? If they are not ignorant of these things, where is the honesty of *leading the public mind astray* by the *mere ambiguities of language?* It is painful to be under the necessity of exposing these dishonourable proceedings. But these gentlemen must blame themselves. The fault is their own; and it is but justice to the public to expose it.†

* Abridgment of Mr. James Owen's Plea, pp. 40, 41.

† The Rev. J. Sinclair has occupied about ten pages of his work on Episcopal or Apostolical Succession, with the *sophistical ambiguity* noticed in the text: he has placed it in front of all his arguments, as though he had nothing better to produce. In this attempt he tries to bring in the Lutheran church, Calvin, Beza, &c., for the support of episcopacy by divine right. The reader has seen the case of the Lutheran church. The Augsburgh Confession expressly declares, that, "*according to the gospel, or jure divino, no jurisdiction belongs to bishops as bishops.*" Beza acknowledges bishops, so does the New Testament. He distinguishes them into *three kinds*.—*Scriptural*, *human*, and *antichristian*: high Church bishops he classes among the

The *French church*, and the *reformed church* in Holland, both maintain equality of bishops and presbyters. The *synod of Dort*, representing the reformed church of Germany, adopted the confession of faith belonging to the Belgic church. The thirty-first article contains this statement: "As regards the ministers of the divine word, they have everywhere the same power and authority." The pastors and seniors of the French churches, met in national council at Vitry in 1682, subscribed the same confession. King James sent some English bishops and divines to the synod of Dort. They gave their suffrages to this confession, along with the rest of the divines, as is clearly stated in session 146. This consent was caught at by some to impugn the *very existence* of an *order of bishops* at all in the Church of England, even as a mere prudential or ecclesiastical arrangement. Carlton, bishop of Chichester, who was one of those that had been present at the synod of Dort by the order of King James, replied to this misinterpretation of their consent to that article, and showed that he and his colleagues had objected to such a construction of the sense of the articles as would encourage opposition to all exercise of superintendency by one class of ministers over others. The members of the synod with whom he conversed declared they wished for some such superintendency as they supposed the English bishops exercised, as calculated to promote good order, and to prevent divisions in the church. Yet they *all*, the English bishops and divines too, gave their *votes* for the confession just quoted, that, "as regards the ministers of the divine word, they have everywhere the *same power and authority*." The case seems to be this:* they all believed that, by divine right, all ministers of the divine word, bishops and presbyters, were equal; but that, as a prudential ecclesiastical

last. See references to him, and to Calvin, &c., in the following section. What delusion, to pretend the authority of these reformers for such an episcopacy as Mr. Sinclair and his high Church brethren maintain!

* So Bishop Carlton, in his Treatise of Jurisdiction, p. 7, quoted by Calamy in his Defence of Moderate Nonconformity: "The *power of order*, by all writers that I could see, even of the Church of Rome, is understood to be immediately from Christ given to ALL *bishops and priests* ALIKE in their consecration."—*Calamy*, vol. i, p. 104, edit. 1703.

arrangement, an order of bishops, as superintendents over other ministers, was not antiscriptual, nor ungodly; but calculated to promote order and peace in the church, and to prevent divisions. This has certainly been the general opinion and practice of the church from the beginning of the second century, up to this day. The church is placed between two evils—the tyranny of the people, and the tyranny of ministers. The divine plan favours neither. The Scriptures lay down only general principles, and leave the details of church government to every society; and while nothing is done contrary either to the letter or the spirit of Scripture, by either ministers or people, we may approve of all, and leave all to the full exercise of their own choice. Whoever takes upon him to condemn those who keep to these limits, is an enemy to the peace of the church.

It is a plain Scriptural principle, that ministers are to *govern* the people:—that they are to govern *according* to the *letter* and *spirit* of *their commission*;—and that, while they so govern, the people are *bound* by the authority of the word of God to *submit* to their government, and to honour them as those who watch for their souls; but when ministers violate the law of their commission, their authority so far ceases, and the people are, in that proportion, free from the obligation to obey them. A *well-guarded* superintendency of one class of ministers over other ministers, if determined upon by the church, is allowable; and is a useful arrangement. All such plans must be judged by their own character and administration. Every reflecting reader will equally admire the divine wisdom in what is *defined*, and in what is *undefined*. What is *defined*, guards against *anarchy:* what is *undefined*, guards against *tyranny*. May Heaven grant both ministers and people to see and preserve their privileges, without abusing the same, either to *anarchy* or *tyranny!*

The *Remonstrants* perfectly acquiesced in the above principles, as may be seen in their Apology by Episcopius.*

The *Waldenses* had the same principles. There are two reasons for mentioning this remarkable people here. The first is, an occasional pretence by some Churchmen,

* Episcopi Opp., vol. ii, par. secund., p. 226, fol., ed. 1665.

that they have had their order of episcopacy by divine right through this church: another is, a feeble and ineffectual attempt of some *Moravian* historians to claim for that church some *superiority* on the same ground. In "An Account of the Doctrine, Manners, Liturgy, and Idiom of the *Unitas Fratrum*, [that is, the Moravians,] taken from, and comprising the supplement [dedicated to the Church of England] of the *Vouchers* to the Report of the Committee of the Honourable the House of Commons, concerning the Church of the *Unitas Fratrum*, lately printed in folio," London, 1749, 8vo., we have a long extract from a letter of Jablonsky, a Moravian bishop, to Archbishop Wake. In this he quotes Comenius, another Moravian bishop and historian, in proof that "the Bohemian Brethren arising from the ashes of *Huss*, regularly received the episcopal order—anno 1467," as follows: "The Brethren's chief concern was about pastors for the souls: whence they should get them, when those they had at present should decease. It was too uncertain a thing, to wait till some of the Roman ordination, for the love of truth, should come over to them. And they remembered, that the forementioned primate of *Bohemia*, Archbishop *Rokyzane*, had often testified that all must be renewed from the bottom. Therefore an ordination was to be begun at home, by that power which Christ had given his church. But they were afraid that it might not be a regular ordination if a presbyter should create a presbyter, and not a bishop. At length, in the year 1467, the chief persons from Bohemia and Moravia, to the number of about seventy, met together in a village near *Richnow*, called *Lhota;* and, having poured forth many prayers and tears to God, that he would vouchsafe to show whether he approved of their design, they resolved to inquire the divine will by lot. They chose, therefore, by vote nine men from among them; and, having put into the hands of a child *twelve* pieces of paper folded up, they bid him distribute to those *nine* men. Now nine of the papers were empty, and only on three stood written—*It is;* so that it was possible they all might get empty papers, which would have imported a negative will of God. But so it was, that the three written ones came into the hands of three among them, viz., *Matthias Kuhnwald*, a very pious man: *Thomas Przelau-*

cius, a learned man; and *Elias Krzenowius*, a man of singular prudence. These found Stephen, bishop of the Waldenses, who sending for the other bishop, and some of the ministers, declared to them their descent from Constantine's time; and also the articles of their doctrine, and the dreadful sufferings they had undergone in Italy and France; and having heard again, with approbation and congratulation, the account which ours gave of their withholding themselves as well from the Calixtines also now as formerly from the pope; and, finally, to enable these three ministers to ordain, they *created them bishops* by imposition of hands, and sent them back in peace." This is Comenius's account, who died 1670. Then Jablonsky speaks of the succession of these bishops in "The Unity," as having "gone on uninterruptedly from the first beginning of the Unity till 1650;" and he proceeds with an account of the succession till the time of writing to Archbishop Wake. At the close of his letter, the mention of the "episcopal succession" occurs three times in two pages; and at page 135 the Church of England is spoken of as "their *only episcopal sister* in the Protestant world."

Arvid Gradin, a person of great trust, and employed on the most important embassies among the Moravians, thus briefly describes this affair: "Being *solicitous* about a regular and apostolical ordination of pastors, there met in the year 1467, out of all Bohemia and Moravia grave, and pious men, about seventy in all, who sent three of their number, being marked out by lot, to Stephen, bishop of the Waldenses, then under banishment in Austria. He having called together the other bishops, his colleagues, *consecrated* these three persons, who were ministers and teachers remarkable for their piety and learning, bishops, by imposition of hands: their names were Matthias of Cunewald, Thomas Praelautensis, and Elias Chrzenovitz." He then speaks of "Comenius complaining that he, like Elias, was alone left remaining, without any hopes of handing down the *apostolical succession* which was *lodged in him;* and accordingly he wrote, in the year 1660, a very *melancholy lamentation*, and dedicated it to the English Church." This, and much more in the same authors, shows a disposition unduly to magnify episcopal ordination and succession. Indeed I think that both Comenius

and Jablonsky really believed in the divine right of episcopacy, as did many divines of the Church of England in the times of Comenius—times of much high Churchism in England. It was well for the Brethren that the truth of the matter was not so; otherwise the church of God had perished among the Bohemians when Comenius died, for Bishop Holmes informs us in the work noticed below, that *the succession expired* in that branch at the death of Comenius, and was not renewed again for nearly one hundred years, viz., in 1735.

However, since the publication of the first edition of this Essay, I have received a candid and excellent letter on the subject of Moravian episcopacy, from the Rev. Benjamin Seifferth, a Moravian minister at Kimbolton. From this I am happy to learn that the Moravians do not hold episcopacy to be of *divine right*. Mr. Seifferth refers in proof of this, among other authorities, to the "History of the United Brethren," by the Rev. John Holmes of Fulneck, Yorkshire, who is a bishop of the Moravian church. At pages 50 to 53, vol. i, the Rev. John Holmes gives the following account of the matter of sending to this Stephen, the supposed bishop of the Waldensian church, for episcopal ordination:—

"A most important subject of deliberation, both at their synods and at other times, was how to maintain a regular succession of ministers, when those who now exercised the ministry among them, and who had previously been ordained among the Calixtines, were dead. For the purpose of coming to a final decision on this point, a synod was convened in 1467, and met in the village of Lhota, in the house of a person of the name of Duchek. Seventy persons were assembled at it, consisting of ministers, noblemen, scholars, citizens, and peasants, deputed by the several congregations of the Brethren in Moravia and Bohemia.

"The synod was opened by fasting, prayer, and reading the Scriptures. After much deliberation, they came to a unanimous resolution to follow the advice of Lupacius and others, and to elect their ministers from their own body. With the example of the election of Matthias before them, (Acts i, 15–26,) who was appointed by lot, they conceived that they were not acting contrary to Scripture by adopting

the same mode, and they reposed implicit confidence in the Lord, who alone hath the disposal of the lot, (Prov. xii, 33,) that, in a case of such emergency as the present, which involved such important consequences to their whole church, he would counsel them according to his will. They first nominated twenty men, from among whom *nine* were chosen, being in their opinion duly *qualified for the office of the ministry*, men of approved piety and irreproachable conduct, and possessing a thorough knowledge of divine truth, and much practical experience. Of this number they determined that THREE should be appointed *by lot for the ministerial office.* Being thus agreed on preliminaries, they prepared twelve slips of paper, on three of which they wrote the word EST, [*this is the man,*] and left the other nine blank. All the twelve slips of paper were then rolled up, put into a small vase, and mixed together.

"Hereupon Gregory addressed the assembly, admonishing them to be fully resigned to the direction and will of God, our heavenly Father, to whom they had referred the decision, *whom* of these nine men he chose to become ambassadors of his Son in the church. He encouraged them confidently to expect that God would hear and answer their prayer. After this they repeated their supplications to the Lord, entreating him so to overrule their present proceedings, that the affirmative lot inscribed with the word EST, might be received by such only of the nine men, previously nominated, as *he himself* designed to appoint to the ministry, or if none of the present candidates were approved by *him*, he would cause each of them to receive a blank, or negative lot. Prayer being ended, they called in a little boy, directing him to hand one of the slips of paper to each of the nine men, who gave them *unopened* to other members of the synod. On opening the papers it was found, that the three inscribed with EST had been received by Matthias of Kunewalde, Thomas of Preschelauz, and Elias of Kreschenow. The whole assembly now joined in a solemn act of thanksgiving to God, joyfully receiving these three men as pastors and teachers, and promising them obedience by giving them the right hand and the kiss of peace. The transaction was closed with the celebration of the Lord's supper.

"The Brethren, however, soon found that the work was not yet complete. *In their own estimation, the appointment of these men for the ministry of the gospel, in the manner described, was sufficiently valid;* but they knew it required something more to give it equal sanction with the religious public. They required regular ecclesiastical ordination. In order to discuss this important subject, another synod was convened before the end of the year. In this assembly two questions were principally agitated.

"The first was, *whether ordination by a number of presbyters was equally valid with that performed by a bishop?* The *decision of the synod* was to this effect:—*That presbyterian ordination was consonant to apostolic practice,* (1 Tim. iv, 14,) *and the usage of the primitive church,* which might be proved from the writings of the primitive fathers: consequently the newly elected ministers might be ordained by those now exercising the sacred functions of the gospel among them, and who had previously been Calixtine clergymen in *priest's* orders. But, as for many ages no ordination had been deemed valid in the reigning church, unless performed by a bishop, they resolved to use every possible means for obtaining episcopal ordination: that their enemies might thus be deprived of every pretext for discrediting the ministry among them.

"This decision involved the second question, which was, to what regularly organized community of Christians the synod might look for episcopal ordination. There could in reality exist but one opinion on this subject. For it was highly improbable, that any bishops connected with the Romish Church would transfer this privilege to the Brethren; and besides this church, they knew only one other Christian community, to which they might apply with any hope of success. This was the Waldensian church. Several circumstances encouraged the Brethren to apply in this quarter. The Waldenses had existed for a long period as a distinct body of Christians, they constituted a regularly organized society, tracing the succession of their bishops from the times of the apostles: they had on a former occasion come to the assistance of the Brethren, and now had several congregations in Austria, served by their own bishops and ministers.

"Conformably to these resolutions of the synod, they

elected three of their ministers, who were *already in priest's orders*, and sent them to the Waldensian bishop, Stephen. Having informed him of the object of their visit the state of the unity of the Brethren, and the transactions of the synod, he received them with demonstrations of the most cordial joy; and in his turn related the leading events in the history of the Waldenses, and gave them an account of their constitution, and the succession of their bishops. Hereupon he ordained these three presbyters bishops of the Brethren's church, with imposition of hands, being assisted by another bishop, and in presence of the elders. *Of these three first bishops* of the Brethren's church, *Melchior Bradacius* is the only one whose name has been handed down to posterity. He had from the very commencement of the church of the Brethren rendered it essential service, and merited an honourable distinction. Of the other two, one had previously exercised the ministry among the Waldenses, and the other in the Romish Church.

"Scarce had these bishops returned to their brethren, when it was resolved to convoke another synod. This assembly was principally occupied in amending and completing their ecclesiastical constitution. In order to this, their first public act was the ordination of the three men, lately appointed by lot for the ministerial office, [to be] presbyters of the Brethren's church. *One of them*, Matthias of Kunewalde, was, before the close of the synod, consecrated bishop. They then proceeded to the appointment of ten co-bishops, or conseniors, elected from the body of presbyters. No doubtful proof this of the increasing number of congregations and members, in connection with the Brethren's church."

The reader will observe several discrepancies between these accounts.

First, as to the opinion of the ancient Brethren about the real importance of episcopacy. Comenius says,—"They were *afraid* that it might not be a regular ordination if a presbyter should create a presbyter, and not a bishop." Arvid Gradin says they were *solicitous* about it. Mr. Holmes says that the *synod* after agitating the subject, decided to this effect: "*that presbyterian ordination was consonant to apostolic practice and the primitive church;*"

and that they adopted episcopal ordination for this special, prudential reason, viz., "*that their enemies might thus be deprived of every pretext for discrediting the ministry among them.*"

Secondly, Comenius, seems to make the meeting at *Lhota*, in which Matthias Kuhnwald, &c., were elected, to be called for the *special* purpose of sending *these* three men to Stephen for episcopal ordination; so does Arvid Gradin: Bishop Holmes makes this meeting appoint these three men to the office of the ministry *without any regard to episcopal ordination;* for at the close of the meeting, "the whole assembly joined in a solemn act of thanksgiving to God, joyfully receiving *these three* men *as their pastors* and teachers, promising them obedience by giving them the right hand and kiss of peace."

Thirdly, both Comenius and Arvid Gradin state that *the three* men who were sent to Stephen, and consecrated bishops by him, were Matthias Kuhnwald, Thomas Przelaucius, and Elias Krzenowius; but Bishop Holmes says the men who went to Stephen, and were consecrated bishops, were *not* the same as those mentioned by Comenius and Gradin; but that one of their names was *Melchior Bradacius;* and that the *names of the other two* have not been "handed down to posterity." Then another synod, a third, is convoked, according to Bishop Holmes, and "their first public act was the *ordination* of the three men, lately *appointed by lot* for the ministerial office, *presbyters* of the Brethren's church. *One* of them Matthias of Kunewalde, was, before the close of the synod, consecrated bishop."

I must confess that such very striking and *material discrepancies*, among these highly respectable historians of the Brethren's church, on a point so important, makes me suspect that there is *very little* of perfectly *authentic history* on the subject of this matter about Stephen and the episcopal ordination and succession. Perrin, who possessed better means of information than almost any other historian of the Waldenses, differs, as we shall soon see, from all these historians: according to him, the *object* of this, the journey, was different; the *persons* sent were different, "*two* ministers and *two* elders:" the *transaction* between Stephen and those persons was different: what they did,

was *not* to give a succession of bishops, but "in TOKEN *of their great joy*, and that holy society and correspondence, which they desired to hold with them, they blessed them, praying and laying their hands upon them." The *whole episcopal* colouring of this affair seems to have arisen from the high Church imagination of Comenius: Jablonsky gladly laid hold of it to propitiate Archbishop Wake, of the Church of England; and hence others have followed in the same track.

But let us direct our inquiry to the opinions and practice of the Waldenses.

The Moravians profess to have their episcopacy from Stephen, whom *they* call bishop of the Waldenses, in 1467. If the Waldenses neither taught this doctrine of high Church bishops, nor maintained such an order, then, of course, they could not give what they possessed not themselves; and all the authority derived from them for these pretensions comes to nothing.

The doctrine of episcopacy by divine right, *if true*, is a matter of the very first importance: all who held it, must have felt it to be so. Had the Waldenses held this, they would have spoken accordingly, in clear, strong, defined terms. Thus they did speak on all subjects they believed to be of great magnitude. It may then be taken as a *sure rule*, that, while the subject was constantly before them, and yet they never say clearly and strongly that the order of bishops, as having superintendency over presbyters, was by *divine right* — no, nor even mention such a thing as bishops among them—that this *negative* evidence is proof they did not hold such a doctrine. But when they say much to the contrary, the proof strengthens still more. Besides, *where* were the Waldenses to get the notion? We have seen that the Roman church never held it: the Greek church never held it: the *Scriptures do not* teach it:—where then were they to get it? He that affirms they held it, must prove his affirmation. *I deny it:* let it be proved. I might rest the matter safely here.

The early and authentic writings of the Waldenses are very few; yet some light may be obtained from them. Let the reader keep one thing in mind: viz., that suppose it could be proved, as a *fact*, that they had presbyters and bishops, still this would not prove that they held the high

Church notions of episcopacy by *divine right*. Jerome constantly mentions bishops in the church, in his day, as a *fact*, but positively denies the *divine right* of episcopacy. The Church of Rome had the distinction between bishops and presbyters as a *fact*, but *never* maintained the *divine right* of episcopacy. The reformers of the English Church established the distinction as a *fact*, but never maintained the *divine right*. By overlooking or denying this difference between the *fact* and the *divine right*, many *showy volumes* have been written in favour of episcopacy, which are nothing but SPLENDID SOPHISMS from end to end. However, *I doubt the fact* of the Waldenses having had bishops in their earliest history. I believe it cannot be proved from any of their documents, *written before* the time when the Moravians profess to have received the episcopal order from them, viz., 1467. Any later evidence will be inconclusive. Much to the contrary certainly appears in their writings before that period, as the following extracts will show. They speak of ministers in the following manner:—

"They who are *pastors* ought to preach to the people, and feed them often with divine doctrine; and chastise the sinners with *discipline*." *Written* A. D. 1100. "Feeding the flock of God, *not* for filthy lucre sake, or [*nor*] as having SUPERIORITY *over the clergy*." "As touching *orders*, we ought to hold that order is called the power which God gives to man, duly to administer and dispense unto the church the word and sacraments. But we find nothing in the Scriptures touching such orders as they" (the Papists) "pretend, but only the *custom* of the church." *Treatise of Antichrist*, A. D. 1220. "All other ministerial things may be reduced to the aforesaid." *Ibid.* "Those that being partakers of the outward ceremonies, *instituted* ONLY *by human inventions*, do believe and hope to partake of the *reality* of pastoral cures and offices, if they be *shaved* or *shorn* like *lambs*, and anointed or *daubed* like *walls*," &c. Having described the ceremonies then used by the Romish Church in *confirmation*, they say, "This is that which they call the sacrament of *confirmation*, which we find *not* instituted either *by Christ*, or his *apostles*—therefore such sacrament is not found needful to salvation: whereby *God is blasphemed*, and which was introduced by

the *devil's instigation*, to seduce the people, and to deprive them of the faith of the church, and that by *such means* they might be induced the more to believe the ceremonies, and the *necessity* of the *bishops*." *Ibid.* Speaking of "*pastors*," *without any distinction*, they say, "*We pastors* do meet together once every year, to determine of our affairs in a general council. Among other powers and abilities which God hath given to his servants, he hath given authority to chuse leaders to rule the people, and to *ordain elders* [*presbyters*] in their charges according to the diversity of the work, in the unity of Christ, which is proved by the saying of the apostle, in the first chapter of his Epistle to Titus: 'For this cause I have left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and *ordain* elders [*presbyters*] in every city as I have appointed thee.' When any of *us*, the aforesaid pastors, falls into any gross sins, he is both excommunicated and prohibited to preach." *From MSS. several hundred years before Luther or Calvin.* Here it is remarkable, that their *quotation* from Titus *stops*, in such a way, as *not* to introduce the term *bishop*, occurring in the next verse. Why was this? The following authorities will answer this question. Reinerus, the oldest authority on their tenets, as a historian, (having written about 1250,) says, "They considered *prelates* to be but scribes and Pharisees: that the *pope* and *all the bishops* were *murderers*, because of the *wars* they waged:—that they were *not to obey the bishops*, but God only: that in the church no one was greater than another: that they HATED the very NAME of PRELATE, as *pope, bishop*," &c. A similar statement is given by Æneas Sylvius: "The Roman bishop, and all bishops are equal. *Among priests*, or *ministers of the gospel*, there is NO DIFFERENCE. The name of a presbyter does not signify a dignity, but superior merit." * Mr. Faber quotes Pilichdorf, saying, "They REJECTED the *consecration of bishops*, priests, churches, altars, &c." †

Perrin remarks, that "the monk Reinerus reported many things concerning the vocation of the pastors of the Waldenses which are *mere fictions;* as that they had a greater bishop and two followers, whom he called the elder

* Catalog. Test. Veritat., vol. ii.
† Faber's Vallenses, p. 418. Lond., 1838.

son, and the younger, and a deacon: that he laid his hands upon others with a sovereign authority, and sent them where he thought good, *like a pope.*"

"Against these *impostures*, here follows what is *found in their writings*, concerning the vocation of their pastors." He then gives the same account from *their own writings* as we have given in the text; but no account of an order of bishops is found in them. There is no distinction among them but what age, or wisdom, or piety, might confer.

Leger gives the monk Reiner's account of this matter a little differently. He introduces him speaking of the barbes or pastors, saying, "that they had always among them some chief pastor, endowed with *the authority** of a bishop, with two coadjutors, one of whom he called his *eldest son*, and the other his *younger.*"† This is certainly more consistent with the other statements of Reiner. For how could he say they had a greater bishop, when he says they *reprobated the very name of bishops?* But he might say that some chief pastor was endowed with *the authority* of a bishop, &c. Their own writings say, "The *last* received pastors must do *nothing without* the license of their *seniors;* as also those that are *first* are to undertake *nothing* without *the approbation* of their companions, that

* Mr. Faber, referring to Gilly's Excurs. to Piedmont, p. 73, says, "The venerable Peyrani, when asked by Dr. Gilly, in the year 1823, whether, in the Vaudois church, there had not formerly been *bishops properly* so called, readily answered, 'Yes: and I should now be styled bishop, for my office is *virtually* episcopal, but it would be absurd to retain the EMPTY title, when we are *too poor* to support the *dignity:* and have little *jurisdiction* save that which is *voluntarily* submitted to among ourselves: the term *moderator* is, therefore, now in use with us, as being more consistent with our *humiliation.*'" Now, if *riches* and *worldly dignities* are necessary to *bishops properly such*, then there were none in the earliest ages of the church, nor of the Waldenses either: the same remark would apply to any jurisdiction with *civil* power to *coerce;* neither the primitive church, nor the ancient Waldenses, knew any thing about such jurisdiction. If the term bishop is an "*empty title*" without these, something very different from primitive episcopacy must be meant by it. "But," says Peyrani, "*a moderator* is *virtually a bishop:*" yes, as much so as a Lutheran superintendent or president. If this is what is meant by being "*properly*" a bishop, then many writers on these subjects express themselves *very improperly.*

† See Peyran's Historical Defence of the Waldenses. Lond., 1826, Appendix, pp. 491, 492.

every thing may be done among us in order. *We pastors* do meet together once every year to determine of our affairs in a general council."* This is *the authority* the *seniors* had. Such have the Lutheran and Wesleyan Methodist superintendents. Such had the bishops in the days of Cyprian. Yet the Waldenses do not appear to have had the NAME of *bishop*. They are said to have HATED THE VERY NAME of bishop. Much less, therefore, had they the doctrine of *divine right*. Indeed this account of Reiner's about a bishop with two coadjutors, an elder son and a younger son, seems not properly to be spoken of the Waldenses at all, but only of those who were properly Paulicians. See Mr. Faber's Vallenses, pp. 564, 565.

Hence it would appear that the Waldenses had no such *name as bishop* for any of their pastors, but that, according to the earliest historians who knew them best, "they *reprobated* the *very name* of bishops." Their pastors fed the flock, ruled the flock, and *ordained* others to the ministry of the word. The Waldenses, then, had *no doctrine of the divine right* of bishops to govern the church, and to have the *sole* right of superintending and ordaining other ministers. The pretence of deriving the *divine right* of episcopacy through the Waldenses is, in truth, *without any solid foundation whatsoever.*

The Moravian bishops have no superintendency by the power of their order over all other ministers: they are ordained by the authority of the elders or presbyters; and are subject to the conference of presbyters. They, by the authority of the presbyters, ordain other ministers. This office of ordaining ministers is their only important difference from presbyters; and as they do it by the authority of the presbyters, it amounts to nothing but a mere ecclesiastical arrangement.

Bishop Holmes says, (p. 25,) "The writings of Wickliffe were the means used by God for illuminating the mind of Huss. Wickliffe himself, on the subject of equality and of gospel ministers, evidently *followed the writings of the ancient Waldenses, for he sometimes uses their very words.* Now Wickliffe boldly affirms all gospel ministers to be equal by divine right. Huss followed him in this and maintained the same point, as may be seen in Fox's Acts

* Perrin, part ii, b. i, chap. 10.

and Monuments.* He is charged with maintaining, and doth not deny it, that he saith, '*All priests are of like power;* and affirmeth, that the reservations of the pope's casualties, the ordering [*ordaining*] of bishops, and the consecration of priests, were invented only for covetousness.' *The Waldenses taught Wickliffe: Wickliffe taught Huss: they all maintained equality, by divine right, of all gospel ministers.*"

All the reformers viewed the Bohemian Brethren's church government in this light.

The English reformers did. A number of the Bohemians fled out of Germany into England in the time of Edward VI. They were incorporated, as a church, under *John Alasco.* Now the later Moravians reckon John Alasco as one of their *bishops* at that time. Let us hear Bishop Burnet's history of this matter: "This summer, John Alasco, with a congregation of Germans that fled from their country upon the persecution raised there, for not receiving the interim, was allowed to hold his assembly at St. Austin's, in London. The congregation was erected into a corporation. John Alasco was to be *superintendent*, and there were four other ministers associated with him. There were also three hundred and eighty of the congregation made denizens of England, as appears by the records of their patents."† In the king's letters patent for their incorporation, the following is the style:—"*De uno superintendente et quatuor verbi ministris erigimus, creamus, ordinamus, et fundamus,*" &c.—"We erect, create, ordain, and found this church, under one *superintendent* and four ministers of the word." Would Alasco, who wanted neither talents nor courage to defend himself, have submitted to the degradation (as a thorough Episcopalian would have supposed it) of being stripped of his dignity in a solemn deed of incorporation, and made a mere superintendent? Would not the same reasoning hold as to the opinion of the other ministers, and the whole church, upon the subject? The word *superintendent* is repeated *ten times* over in these documents; but *never* the word *bishop* as applied to Alasco, or to any minister of the Bohemian church.

The Rev. Benjamin Seifferth, in the letter before mentioned, speaking of John Alasco, thinks I am in an error

* Vol. i, p. 791, &c., ed. 1641, folio. † Vol. ii, part i.

in supposing that the latter Moravian historians reckon him as one of their bishops. He says, "Count Zinzendorf, indeed, fell into this error; but I believe it has been acknowledged to be an error. Holmes is not chargeable with it; nor, as far as I am aware, are any of our writers; and Comenius, and especially Regenvolscius, show that à Lasco was not even a member of the Brethren's church, though a warm friend to it." I have given Mr. Seifferth's statement. Now it seems Count Zinzendorf believed à Lasco, or Alasco, belonged to the Moravians; and the highly authoritative work above quoted, taken from the *Vouchers* presented to the House of Commons, and indeed to both houses of Parliament, considers the transaction in Edward's time to have been with the Brethren's church, and of course with à Lasco as its chief minister. See p. 134 of that work. And, in a note on the same page, they speak of "*one of our* [Moravian] bishops having been in the commission for reforming ecclesiastical laws in England. We cannot forbear giving the honoured reader two of the most remarkable passages of *our said Bishop John à Lasco's* Preface to the Liturgy, for his Congregation at Austin Friars," in 1550: a similar statement, as to his being a Moravian minister, is made in a note at p. 108, —"This noble *prelate of ours*." It is not for me to decide who is right in this matter.

It would be easy to prove that the Lutheran church viewed this Bohemian episcopacy as a mere ecclesiastical arrangement, amounting in substance to nothing more than the same arrangement among themselves: sometimes denominating the individual a superintendent, as in Germany, generally; and sometimes a bishop, or even archbishop, as in Sweden and Denmark. All the Swiss and Geneva reformers prove this by expressing their approbation of the church discipline of the Bohemians and Waldenses; for every body knows that these reformers determinately maintained the *equality by divine right of all gospel ministers*.

Indeed the story about that *Stephen*, who, the Moravians say, conveyed to them this episcopal succession, is very differently related by *Perrin*, one of the earliest of the modern historians of the Waldenses. He *had more authentic documents* connected with their ancient history than any later historian ever possessed. He says, "About

1467, the *Hussites*, reforming and separating their churches from the Church of Rome, understood that there were some churches of the *ancient Waldenses* in Austria, lying upon the frontiers of *Bohemia*, in which there were *great and learned men ordained, and appointed* to be PASTORS; and that the doctrine of the gospel flourished in its full force and vigour among them: then that *they might be informed of the truth thereof, they sent two of their ministers with two elders*, giving them in charge to inquire into, and know what those flocks or congregations were; for what reason they had separated themselves from the Church of Rome: their principles and progress; and also to discover and make known unto them the beginning of their own conduct in Bohemia, and to acquaint them with the cause and reason of their separation and dissension from the Romish Church.

"These men being arrived thither, and having found out those Waldensian churches, after a diligent and careful search after them, they told them, that they did nothing but what was agreeable to the ordinances of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the doctrine of his apostles, confining themselves wholly to the institution of the Son of God in the matter of the sacrament.

"It was a matter of great joy and satisfaction to the Waldenses, to understand, that a great number of people in Bohemia had advanced the glory of God, by casting off the corruptions and idolatries of the Roman Church, and exhorting them in God's name to continue and carry on that work which they had so well begun, for the knowledge and maintenance of the truth, and for the establishment of a good order and discipline among them; in *token* of their great joy, and that holy society and correspondence which they desired to hold with them, *they blessed them, praying and laying their hands upon them.*" * And then, having mentioned the burning of a great number of the Waldenses in a violent persecution, he says, "Among others, the history gives us an account of ONE STEPHEN, AN ELDERLY MAN, who being burnt there," (at Vienna,) "*confirmed many by his constancy.*" The translation I quote is by "A lover of our Protestant Establishment, both in church and state." Perhaps "one Stephen, an

* Perrin's History of the Old Waldenses, part ii, b. ii, chap. 10.

elderly man," should have been translated, "*one Stephen*, a *presbyter* or *elder*." *This is the very Stephen* of whom the *Moravians* speak as conveying the *episcopal succession to them*. Hence they sometimes speak about *the Church of England* as "*their only episcopal sister*." The missionary labours of the Brethren we would duly estimate: much may be said for their simple manners and piety; yet all such representations as tend to *confine* a gospel ministry and gospel ordinances to any *episcopal succession schemes* are to be suspected. Their tendency is to bind the blessings of Christianity by ordinances that God never made. No order of men ought to be encouraged to assume such powers. Simplicity may be frequently beguiled by them, and may look upon them as harmless; but those who study the subject in the light of history and the knowledge of human nature will think very differently.

As to *apostolical succession*, Reiner testifies that the Waldenses maintained, "that those *only* are the *successors* of the APOSTLES who *imitate* their *lives*. *Inferring* from thence, saith he, that the pope, the bishops, and clergy, who enjoy the riches of this world, and seek after them, do not follow the *lives* of the apostles, and therefore are *not* the true guides of the church; it having never been the design of our Lord Jesus Christ to commit his *chaste* and *well-beloved spouse* to those who would rather *prostitute it* by their wicked examples and works, than preserve it in the same purity in which they received it at the beginning, *a virgin chaste and without spot*." This is the true view of the apostolical succession. The reformers contended for this. We rejoice to believe that the bishops and presbyters in the Moravian church have *this succession;* but most eminently so their missionaries, and all other devoted missionaries to the heathen. May every church zealously contend for *this succession*, and may their labours be crowned with apostolical success in the conversion of thousands and tens of thousands from idols to the living God!

The matter of the *Scotch church*, and all the *dissenting churches*, as maintaining the identity by divine right of all ministers, is denied by none, and therefore needs no proof.

The reader will have long since perceived that the main

end of this argument upon the *identity* of bishops and presbyters, as one and the *same office*, is to show that presbyters have EQUALLY as much DIVINE *authority* to ORDAIN others to the Christian ministry as bishops have. Another *prerogative*, however, is generally claimed for bishops, viz., that of CONFIRMATION. We have taken but little notice of this; yet it would hardly suit the design of this Essay wholly to omit it. We account it not of sufficient importance for lengthened remark or discussion in a separate section: a brief notice of it here, therefore, by way of episode, may suffice. We may comprise all that is necessary to be said on the subject in two particulars: first, as to the thing itself; and secondly, as to the minister who may perform it.

First, as to the thing itself. Those illustrious witnesses to the truth against Popery, the Waldenses, as we have seen, speaking on the subject, say, "This is that which they call *confirmation*, which we find *not* instituted either by Christ or his apostles; therefore such sacrament is not found needful to salvation; whereby God is blasphemed, and which was introduced by the devil's instigation, to seduce the people, and to deprive them of the faith of the church, and that by *such means* they might be induced the more to believe the *ceremonies*, and the NECESSITY of *bishops*." Wickliffe also says, "It does not appear that this sacrament should be *reserved* to a Cesarean *prelacy*; that it would be more devout and more conformable to Scripture language, *to deny* that the *bishops give the Holy Spirit*, or confirm the giving of it; and that it therefore seems to some, that the brief and trivial confirmation of the PRELATES, and the ceremonies added to it for the sake of pomp, were introduced at the *suggestion of Satan*, that the people may be deceived as to the faith of the church, and that the state and *necessity* of *bishops* may be more acknowledged."* Melancthon observes, "The rite of confirmation, as retained by bishops, is altogether an *idle ceremony*; but an *examination* of youth, in order to a profession of their faith, with public *prayer* for the *pious* part of them, would be useful, and the *prayer* would not be in *vain*."† Ravanel, whose work had the approbation of the

* Vaughan's Life of Wickliffe, vol. ii. p. 308, sec. ed., 1831.
† Loci Communes, de Confirmatione.

French reformed church, says, "The wrangling Popish divines maintain the dignity and efficacy of *confirmation* ABOVE the sacrament of *baptism* itself; for they assert that it is not lawful for any one but a bishop to confer it, while they concede that *presbyters* can administer baptism; and they *impiously* teach that *confirmation* is a *certain perfecting* and *consummating* of *baptism*, as if those were to be counted only *half Christians* who are baptized only, and not confirmed: whereas the apostle testifies that we put on Christ in baptism." * Bishop Taylor boldly declares, that, until we are confirmed, we are imperfect Christians: such, "*without a miracle*, are not perfect Christians:" that is, not really Christians at all. Calvin has some admirable remarks upon the subject, Inst., lib. iv, c. 19. He approves of a similar procedure to that mentioned above by Melancthon. He exposes the absurdity and impiety of taking the act of the apostles in conferring the *visible* and MIRACULOUS GIFTS of the Holy Ghost, by the *laying on of their hands* upon the baptized, as *a ground* for the *pretence* of bishops to confer the *Holy Ghost* by the *laying on* of THEIR *hands* in confirmation. He calls them "*apes* of the apostles." He shows that by this kind of pretence they *invalidate baptism itself*, thus making void the commandments of God by the traditions of men, and exclaims, "O the iniquity of this proceeding!" He then offers ironically an *improved definition* of confirmation, viz., that it is "*a marked disgrace* to baptism, which obscures the use of baptism, yea, *abolishes* it: the devil's false promise, to draw us away from the true promises of God." The rite of confirmation in the English Church differs from the Popish one in that it is not called a sacrament; and some ceremonies are laid aside: in *all other* respects it is *equally unscriptural* in its pretences, and *dangerous* in its *consequences*. To establish a claim to it as a prerogative of bishops, in imitation of the apostles, they, the bishops, *must* confer the *gift of miracles*. The latter they cannot do: the *claim*, therefore, *exposes Christianity itself to contempt*. This claim ought to be given up. Bishop Taylor, speaking of the Popish doctrine of *extreme unction*, says, "When the *miraculous* healing ceased, then they were *not Catholics*, but *heretics*, that did transfer it to the use of

* Bibliotheca Sacra, sub voce.

dying persons." By this rule he would convict the Church of England of heresy in the use of confirmation. It doubtless imbodies serious errors; though we do not say it constitutes heresy. Every Christian has a right to reprobate it as a public injury to religion. It is *degrading* also to all other ministers, as implying that the sacrament of *baptism*, as administered by them, is *imperfect*. It derogates from the sacrament of baptism itself.* Besides, there is the solemn declaration made by the bishop, in administering the rite of confirmation, that the "Almighty and everlasting God HAS GIVEN FORGIVENESS OF ALL THEIR SINS"—*all* their *actual personal sins*—to the MULTITUDES of *young persons* brought to be confirmed, many of whom are plainly ungodly persons, and who had never been seen by the bishop before. This is enough to make any pious person tremble. It is a daring presumption, only equalled by the height of Popery itself. The great danger to souls is, that multitudes believe it. I pity many good men who are entangled with these things. The reformers of the English Church might find some excuse for retaining them, because it was difficult in the darkness of those times to see the truth in all things; but there can be no excuse at this day for retaining them. Every Protestant ought to protest against these corruptions of Christianity. Melancthon's view contains all that the Scriptures warrant.

Secondly, let us consider who is the minister to whom the administering of this rite belongs. Indeed, as there is *no divine* authority for the thing itself, of course there is no divine regulation about the minister. Bishop Burnet grants, that there is "no express institution of it, neither by Christ nor his apostles: no rule given to practice it." †

* Bishop Heber, in his Life of Bishop Taylor, speaking of his work on Confirmation, says, "There is, indeed, a *dangerous consequence* attendant on both Taylor's arguments, that, by *limiting the gift of the Holy Ghost* to *confirmation*, he *makes* BAPTISM, taken by itself, of NONE EFFECT, or, *at most*, of no further effect than as a decent and necessary introduction to that which would be, on this hypothesis, the main and distinctive consignation of a Christian." King James I., at the Hampton Court conference, declared his opinion, "that arguing a confirmation of baptism, as if this sacrament without it were of no validity, is plainly blasphemous."

† Burnet on the Articles, art. 25.

The whole is merely a matter of human arrangement. However, Bishop Taylor dashes off the affirmation, that "*bishops were* ALWAYS, *and the* ONLY *ministers of confirmation.*" It is humiliating to find this splendid writer frequently so reckless in assertion, and so careless of proof. Bishop Heber candidly acknowledges, in his admirable Life of Taylor, that "he was *any thing* rather than a critical inquirer into *facts* (however strange) *of history* or *of philosophy. If* such alleged facts *suited his purpose,* he received them *without examination,* and retailed them *without scruple.*" Vol. ii, p. 179, 12mo. Now, to overturn forever, and from the foundation, his rash affirmation, and all similar affirmations, we have only to bring before the reader the indisputable fact, that in the Greek church it *never* was *confined* to the bishops, but *always* was, and *is* to the present day, administered *by presbyters and bishops promiscuously.* There is no satisfactory proof, indeed, that it existed at all in the early ages of the church, after the apostles' time, in the sense and manner in which it is now used in the Church of England. As the *concluding part* of baptism; and as a way of *confirming* the *baptism of heretics,* it somewhat early came into the church, as may be seen in Cyprian, epist. 72 and 76, ed. Pamel.: in Suicer's Thesaurus, vol. ii, col. 1534, &c.; ed. 1682; and Calderwood's Altare Damascenum, p. 257, &c., ed. 1708. "The *invention,*" says Bishop Burnet, art. 25, "that was afterward found out, by which the bishop was held to be the *only* minister of confirmation, even though presbyters were suffered to confirm, was *a piece of superstition without any colour from Scripture.*—In the Latin church, Jerome tells us, that in his time bishops only confirmed; though he makes the *reason* of this to be rather for doing to them *honour,* than from any necessity of *law.*—It is said by Hilary, that in Egypt the *presbyters did confirm* in the bishop's absence; so *that custom grew* to be the *universal practice of the Greek church.*" The learned Mr. Smith, in his work on the "Present State of the Greek Church." tells us, that "the *administration of confirmation is conceded to bishops and presbyters promiscuously*" in the present Greek Church: p. 112, ed. sec., 1678. The Church of Rome, as an *ordinary* rule, confines it to bishops, but has *always* granted that presbyters, by the permission of the

Confused?

church, were capable of administering confirmation; and presbyters have actually and frequently administered it in that church.* So much for the truth of Bishop Taylor's rash and reckless affirmation, that "*bishops* were *always*, and the *only* ministers of confirmation."

There is no divine authority for the thing: the present mode of administering it is full of presumption and danger. In a reformed state of the matter, presbyters might, by the will of the church, be equally as efficient administrators of it as bishops. To claim it as a divine prerogative of bishops, is like all the other assumptions of this scheme—*an utterly baseless assumption.*

Here, then, is abundant proof of the shallowness of the pretence of some who seem to boast as though almost all the authority of the Christian church was on the side of their *high Church claims* for *episcopal succession.* The truth is, we see, that NO CHRISTIAN CHURCH EVER MAINTAINED IT: MANY have expressly NEGATIVED these claims: NONE ever AFFIRMED them.

The maintaining of the true Scriptural liberty of every section of the Christian church is a matter of great importance to Christianity itself, and to the peace of the Christian world at large. While no Scriptural principles are violated, and while the morals of the church are not corrupted, each church has the sacred right of adopting what form of government it deems the best. No section of the Christian church has any authority, beyond these principles, to bind the practices of another church. Every attempt to do this is essentially Popery: it is antichrist, setting up his throne in the church above the throne of God himself. Episcopacy, *if administered with humility, and in a pacific spirit*, may, on these principles of Christian truth, be adopted and justified; but, if its advocates become *proud and insolent* to those churches who adopt it not; if they insult the ministers, and endeavour to disturb the minds of the private members of those churches by unscriptural declamation and denunciation against the validity of their ordinances; if they proudly arrogate to themselves the *sole* right to administer the ordinances of the gospel: in such a case, they commence a spiritual usurpa-

* See the Canon Law, distinction 95, and Lancelot's Notes on the same.

tion and tyranny in the church of God. To overturn such a system is to defend the gospel; and its overthrow will promote the peace of the whole Christian world.

SECTION IX.

THE GREATEST DIVINES OF ALL AGES SHOWN TO BE AGAINST THESE EXCLUSIVE CLAIMS FOR THE DIVINE RIGHT OF BISHOPS.

Of course this point has been anticipated in the preceding sections; for while it has been shown that no church ever affirmed this order of bishops by divine right, but that all churches have substantially negatived it, the doctrine of these churches proves the opinion of the *greatest divines of all ages* to have been against the tenet of bishops being by divine right an order distinct from, and superior to, presbyters; having government over ministers as well as over people; and the sole power and authority of ordaining other ministers in the church of God. But besides their testimony in the voice of their different churches, many of them have spoken so expressly upon the subject, that it may be worth while to hear them deliver their own decisions.

First, THE CHRISTIAN FATHERS.—We have treated this subject in a former section. We shall give the learned Stillingfleet's opinion in connection with this point. "I believe," says he, "upon the strictest inquiry, Medina's judgment will prove true, that Hieron, Austin, Ambrose, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact, were all of Aerius's judgment, as to the *identity* of both name and order of bishops and presbyters, in the primitive church; but here lay the difference, Aerius from thence proceeded to separation from the bishops and their churches, because they were bishops."*

WICKLIFFE:—I boldly assert one thing, viz., that in the primitive church, or in the time of Paul, two orders of the clergy were sufficient, that is, a priest and a deacon.

* Irenicum, p. 276, sec. ed., 1662.

In like manner I affirm, that in the time of Paul, the *presbyter and bishop* were names of the *same office*. This appears from the third chapter of the First Epistle to Timothy, and in the first chapter of the Epistle to Titus. And the same is testified by that profound theologian, Jerome."*

ERASMUS:—"Anciently none were called priests but *bishops and presbyters, who were the* SAME, but afterward presbyters were distinguished from the priest;"† that is, from the bishop.

CRANMER:—"The bishops and priests [presbyters] were at one time, and were *no two* things, but BOTH ONE in the beginning of Christ's religion."‡

DR. WHITAKER, one of the greatest Protestant champions in the days of Queen Elizabeth and James I.:—"Formerly there was *no difference* between a presbyter and a bishop.—For the placing of bishops over presbyters WAS A HUMAN ARRANGEMENT—*ordo humanus fuit*—devised to take away schisms, as history testifies."§

CALVIN:—"The reason why I have used the terms bishops and presbyters, and pastors and ministers, promiscuously, is, because the Scriptures do the same; for they give the title of *bishops* to *all* persons whatsoever, who were *ministers* of the *gospel*."‖

BEZA:—"The authority of all pastors is equal among themselves; also their office is one and the same."¶ As mighty efforts are often made to bring in the authority of Beza for these claims, we will add another passage or two from this great reformer. In his work on the Church, De Ecclesia, above quoted, he begins the thirty-second section thus:—"At length we come to the third species of *ecclesiastical offices* viz., that which pertains to *spiritual jurisdiction*. Now *this jurisdiction* was committed to presbyters PROPERLY SO CALLED; whose name implies as much as though you should call them *senators* or *elders*. The apostle, in 1 Cor. xii, 28, calls them *governors* or *rulers*. And Christ designates the college of presbyters,

* Vaughan's Life of Wickliffe, vol. ii, p. 275, sec. ed. Lond., 1831.
† Scholia in Epist. Hieron. ad Nepot., folio 6, vol. i, ed. 1516.
‡ Burnet's History of the Reformation.
§ Whitakeri Opp, pp. 509, 510, fol. Genev., 1610.
‖ Instit., lib. 4, c. 8, sec. 8. ¶ De Eccles., sec. 29.

the church, because in them resided the SUPREME POWER in the government of the church." Here "presbyters *properly so called*, have committed to them the *spiritual jurisdiction* of the church, and SUPREME *power*." How strange! to pretend that such a writer is an advocate for the *supreme* power of bishops by divine right. Beza, speaking of the angel of the church, mentioned Rev. ii, 1, calls him the president, "who," he says, "ought in the first place to be admonished about these matters, and then by him his other colleagues, and so the whole church. But from this to try to prove the establishment of that order of *episcopacy* which was *afterward* introduced into the church of God by *human* arrangements, is what neither can nor ought to be done: it will not even follow from this place that the *office* of president should necessarily be *perpetual*: even as it is now at length clear by that *tyrannical oligarchy*" (that is, the bishops) "whose *head* or *apex* is *antichrist*, and *who arose* from *this scheme* with the most *pernicious effect* upon the *whole church*, and upon the *world*."

MELANCTHON:—"They who taught in the church, and baptized, and administered the Lord's supper, were called *bishops or presbyters*; and those were called deacons who distributed alms in the church. But these offices were not so separated as to make it sinful for a deacon to teach, or to baptize, or to administer the eucharist. Indeed all these things are lawful to all Christians; for the keys are given to all. Matt. xviii." *

M. FLACIUS ILLYRICUS.—Treating of the time of the apostles, he says, "*A presbyter* was *then* the *same* as a *bishop*." Speaking of the *primitive church*, he says, "The bishop was the first presbyter among the presbyters of each church, and this was done for the sake of order." And, after quoting Jerome's statement, that, in the *apostles' time*, *bishops and presbyters* were *not* distinguished one from the other, but that this distinction, of one to preside over the rest, was made *afterward*, as a remedy against schism, Flacius himself remarks, "Hence it is evident that, about this time, in the end of the first or the beginning of the second century, this *alteration* took place, so

* Loc. Com., 12mo. Basil, 1521.

that episcopacy is not so much by divine appointment as by human authority." *

BLONDELL and DALLEUS :—"*Episcopacy* as *now* distinguished from presbyters, according to the *custom* of the church from the *third* century, is *not* of *apostolical* appointment, but *merely* of *human* institution." †

CLAUDE :—"As to those who were ordained by mere priests, [presbyters,] can the author of the Prejudices be ignorant that the distinction of a bishop and a priest, or minister, as if they had two different offices, is not only a thing that they cannot prove out of the Scriptures, but that even contradicts the express words of the Scripture, where *bishops and priests* are the names of *one* and the *same office*, from whence it follows that the priests have, by their first institution, a right to confer ordination, that cannot be taken from them by mere human rules." ‡

BOCHART :—"If the question be as to the antiquity, I am plainly of opinion, with Jerome, that in the apostles' age, there was no difference between bishops and presbyters, and that the churches were governed by the common council of the presbyters. Therefore presbyters are more ancient than bishops. In the mean time I grant that episcopal government is very ancient, and that, a little after the apostles' times, it became universal and greatly useful." See his letter to Morley, chaplain to King Charles I., and afterward bishop of Worcester. Upon this letter the Rev. James Owen remarks, "Of late years some arts have been used to procure letters from some eminent foreign divines, to condemn the nonconformists here, without hearing both sides. This is evident by Dr. Morley's letter to the famous Bochart." §‖

* Catalog. Test. Varitat., vol. i, p. 84.

† Vid. Beverigii Codex Can. Eccles. Prim. Vind. Proem.

‡ Defence of the Reformation, part iv, p. 95.

§ Abridgment of Mr. James Owen's Plea, p. 39.

‖ "When the French churches were *earnestly solicited* (particularly by Bishop Moreton) to receive a *clergy ordained* by *English bishops*, they *absolutely refused* that motion: Peter Moulin, a famous French Protestant minister, in his letter to the bishop of Winchester, excusing himself for not making the difference between bishops and presbyters to be of *divine appointment*, he pleads,—*that if he had laid the difference on that foundation, the French churches would have silenced him.*" —Ibid. pp. 37, 38.

GROTIUS:—"Επισκοπη, or the office of a bishop, signifies inspection or oversight of any kind. The *inspectors, or those who* PRESIDE over the *church*, ARE PRESBYTERS. The *chief of those presbyters*, AFTERWARD, by way of excellence, BEGAN to be *called bishop*, as is evident from those canons which are called apostolical canons, in the Epistles of Ignatius, in Tertullian, and others." * When this illustrious scholar had received a copy of the celebrated Epistle of Clemens Romanus, he tells us he "read and re-read it." He then gives his judgment in the following manner:—"Clemens *never* mentions that extraordinary authority of bishops, which, *after* the death of St. Mark, *began by the custom of the church* to be introduced at Alexandria, and, by this example, elsewhere; but he plainly shows, *as St. Paul does*, that the churches were then governed by the *common council of the presbyters: which presbyters both Clemens and St. Paul say were the* SAME AS BISHOPS." † And, in his posthumous work, quoted by many Episcopalian writers with the greatest confidence, and even with something like triumph, he *plainly declares*, that "episcopal pre-eminence, or the superiority of one minister over others, is NOT of *divine right*." "This," says he, "is *sufficiently proved*, because *the contrary is* NOT *proved*." ‡ Logic this, which these writers are *well pleased to forget*, but which their readers should always have in mind.

Here, perhaps, is a proper place to point out a mistake into which many Church-of-England divines have fallen. They have found that Calvin, Beza, and other illustrious foreigners, praised the ecclesiastical order in the Church of England, and have immediately jumped to the conclusion, that those divines and great scholars were in favour of *episcopacy by divine right*. Now the whole conduct of Calvin and Beza, for instance, in the government of their churches, as well as their declaration in the above quotations, distinctly shows the contrary. The case of Zanchius will illustrate the matter still further.

ZANCHIUS, says the Rev. J. Sinclair, "was by some

* Annot. in 1 Tim. iii.

† Grotii Epist., No. 347, ed. Amstel., fol., 1687.

‡ De Imperio Sum. Potest. circa Sacra, cap. xi, p. 327, ed. Paris, 1647.

reputed among the most learned of Calvin's contemporaries." Mr. Sinclair, and some others, catch at an admission of this eminent reformer, that episcopacy *may* be properly established, as *one form* of church government, as though by this admission he meant to support episcopacy by *divine right*. *This is a fallacy which such writers always employ;* without it they cannot stir a single step in this controversy. Zanchius spent nearly the whole of his life in the services of a church that was *wholly presbyterian*. This *practice*, therefore, utterly destroys all the claims of *exclusive* Episcopalians to the benefit of his testimony. In his Confession of his Faith, he solemnly delivers his judgment on the subject of ministerial equality: chapter twenty-fifth contains thirty-nine aphorisms on the government of the church, and on the ministry of the gospel. In aphorism ninth, he says that the Lord Jesus Christ constituted *five* orders of ministers,—"apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and doctors, Ephes. iv, 11." The first three he says were extraordinary and temporary: the two last "ordinary and perpetual." "For," says he, "the frequent mention by the apostles, of bishops, presbyters, and teachers, does *not* constitute *new orders;* for those who are called pastors are the *same* as are always signified by bishops; and often by the name of presbyters." Zanchius maintained the notion that presbyters sometimes meant lay elders as church rulers; and, therefore, he says, that presbyters often signified pastors, though, in his view, not always. Then, aphorism tenth, the title is, "*The fathers* not condemned by us because *they added more orders* of ministers." In aphorism eleventh, he explains himself about these *new orders, added* by the fathers, to what Christ and his apostles instituted. 'Therefore," says he, "seeing that all the former ministers of the gospel were EQUALLY *called pastors, bishops, and presbyters*, and seeing they were ALL OF EQUAL AUTHORITY, *one began afterward* to be placed over all his colleagues; although not as a master or lord, but as a head in a college to the rest of the fellows of the college: to him principally was committed the care of the whole church, and therefore it became the *custom* to give him alone, by way of excellence, the name of bishop or pastor: the rest of his colleagues *being content* with the name of presbyter; so that there

began to be only one bishop and many presbyters in *each* city: this arrangement we judge is not at all to be condemned. As to which matter the account of Jerome, and the judgment he delivers in his Epistle to Evagrius, in his comment on Titus, is embraced by us, where he declares that this whole arrangement was rather *from custom* than divine appointment, to take away dissensions and schisms. *On the same ground* we think the appointment of archbishops, and even of the four patriarchs, which took place indeed before the council of Nice, may be excused and defended; although all these in course of time were carried to the highest ambition and tyranny. This is the reason why the nearer an approach is made in the orders of ministers to apostolical simplicity, the more we approve it; and we judge that due care should everywhere be used to attain to this simplicity." Then, at the close of the chapter is an enumeration of *errors* to be rejected: the eleventh is, that of "extending the authority of a bishop beyond that given by Christ who called him." Here we see Zanchius solemnly declare his faith to be, that "*all the ministers* of the gospel, instituted by Christ and his apostles, were *equally* called pastors, bishops, and presbyters, seeing they were *all of* EQUAL AUTHORITY;" that bishops, as superintendents over other ministers, were "*added* by the fathers;" and the ground of their existence, as such, is the same as that of archbishops and patriarchs, which all grant to be *merely a human arrangement. Zanchius, then, maintained that episcopacy was merely a human arrangement;* yet these men quote him to prove its *divine right:* Zanchius maintained that it might be approved and justified when *modestly* used; yet these men quote him to maintain its necessity and its *exclusiveness* against the validity of all other forms!

But Calvin, Beza, Zanchius, &c., had no objection to episcopacy as an *ecclesiastical* arrangement of a superintendency of one minister over other ministers, for the sake of order and good government in the church: provided it could be *guarded* against a tendency to ecclesiastical *tyranny*. Very right. The Wesleyan Methodists adopt the same opinion, and practise it under a very extended superintendency. It is so guarded among them as to prevent the possibility of supposing one minister superior by

divine right to another. The truth of the case is, then, that these great continental divines and scholars, in their approbation of the ecclesiastical arrangements in the Church of England, show that they really believed the episcopacy of that Church NOT to be of *divine right*, but of *human authority:* this is the only legitimate conclusion that can be drawn from their statements and conduct: a conclusion directly opposed to the end for which many of the Episcopalians now quote them. Indeed, these men pervert and abuse the authority of the great reformers, and continental divines.

VITRINGA:—"All the rulers or governors of the church of Ephesus were equally, and without the least difference, called bishops, presbyters, and pastors. Acts xx, 17, &c. Yea, indeed, were we to collect all those places in the historical books, and epistles of the New Testament, in which the persons presiding over the church are mentioned, under different circumstances, we should meet with them *everywhere equal* both in name and in office, no difference at all ever being made between them. Bishops, presbyters, and pastors, according to the style of the sacred Scriptures, are names designating *one and the same order* of men: they are neither distinguished in the kind of their order, nor their office. This position will stand, I am persuaded, as long as the Acts of the Apostles and their epistles shall be read without prejudice."*

MOSHEIM:—"The rulers of the church were called either presbyters or bishops, which two titles are, in the New Testament, undoubtedly applied to the *same order* of men."†

SUICER:—"At the first, therefore, *all presbyters were equally* over the flock, and *had none over themselves;* for *they were called bishops*, and had *episcopal power*, and acknowledged *none above themselves, seeing they all came by order to the* PRIMACY, WHICH PRIMACY was only a matter of *order by* SITTING in the FIRST CHAIR, and conferred *no superior power*. And this was the constitution of the church under the government of the *apostles*. *Afterward*, when bishops were made above presbyters, *both being the* SAME *in name and reality*, then the bishops presided over

* De Synagog. Vet., lib. 2, cap. 2, pp. 447 and 485.
† Eccles. Hist., vol. i, p. 101.

the presbyters of each city, all bishops being accounted equal. This state of things continued till the council of Nice; A. D. 325, or a little after. From that time metropolitans were placed over the bishops of a province, and had the right of ordaining the bishops of that province."*

SCHLEUSNER:—"For at length, *after* the apostles' age, that *difference was introduced* between the bishops and presbyters, that the bishops should have the greater dignity, as Suicerus rightly states in his Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus."†

ARCHBISHOP USHER:—"I asked him [Abp. Usher] also his judgment about the validity of *presbyter's ordination:* which he *asserted*, and told me that the king [Charles I.] asked him, at the Isle of Wight, wherever he found in antiquity, that *presbyters alone ordained* any? and that he answered, I can show your majesty *more, even where* PRESBYTERS ALONE SUCCESSIVELY ORDAINED BISHOPS; and instanced in Hierome's words, *Epist. ad Evagrium*, of the presbyters of Alexandria chusing and making their own bishops from the days of Mark till Heraclas and Dionysius."‡ And his express words, quoted by Dr. Parr, in his Appendix to the Archbishop's Life, are these—"A presbyter hath the *same order* in specie with a bishop: ergo, a presbyter hath EQUALLY *an intrinsic power to give orders*, and is *equal* to him in the *power* of *order*."§

Now here is a host of men, whose qualifications for giving their judgment in this matter were never surpassed, *all determining*, with one voice, that BY DIVINE RIGHT ALL MINISTERS OF THE GOSPEL ARE EQUAL; and that the order of bishops, *as now* existing, is only a HUMAN ARRANGEMENT.

Here, then, this *all-deciding point* is placed on the *basis* of a CATHOLIC OR UNIVERSAL DOCTRINE of the *Christian church*. The celebrated rule of *Vincentius Lirinensis* is, that a doctrine truly catholic, is one "believed *in all places, at all times, and by all the faithful*. And we are thus catholic, when we follow *universality*, *antiquity*, and *consent;* but we follow *universality*, when we profess that only to be

* Thesaur. Eccles., tom. i, col. 1180.

† Lex. Gr. in Nov. Test., sub. voce επισκοπος.

‡ Life of Baxter, by Sylvester, fol., lib. i, part. ii, sec. 63, p. 206.

§ See Dr. John Edwards's Discourse on Episcopacy, chap. xiv.

the true faith which is professed by the *church all the world over*. In like manner, we are followers of *antiquity*, when we religiously adhere to that *sense of Scripture* which *manifestly obtained among the holy fathers*, our predecessors. And lastly, we follow *consent*, when we embrace the definitions and opinions of *almost all*, if not all, the bishops and teachers of the ancient church."* Vincentius himself shows no case in which this rule more fully applied than it applies to the position, that all gospel ministers are, by divine right, *equal* in power and authority in the Christian church.

The MAIN PILLAR of this semi-popish succession scheme was the assumption of the DIVINE RIGHT of episcopacy. But we have now shown that presbyters and bishops are *one and the same*, by the supreme authority of the SACRED SCRIPTURES most expressly; by the *consent* of the FATHERS; and by the *consent of* ALL THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES in the world. The following conclusions, then, are fully established:—

1. ALL THE ACTS of presbyters are, by divine right, of EQUAL AUTHORITY with the acts of any bishops or archbishops whatever.

2. ORDINATION *by presbyters* has *equal divine authority* with ordination by bishops; and is *more conformable* to the Holy Scriptures.

3. Presbyters are EQUALLY as much SUCCESSORS of the apostles, in *all the rights* and *authority* remaining to the ministers of Christ, as the bishops are.

4. Whatever evidence, moreover, there is in any episcopal church for an UNINTERRUPTED LINE of *bishops* from Peter, or any other apostle, there is the *same evidence* for an UNINTERRUPTED LINE *of presbyters* from that very apostle to the present day in every other Protestant church in the world. No man can properly or Scripturally be a bishop, except he be first a presbyter. Every bishop, then, necessarily presupposes a presbyter: where there is no presbyter there can be no bishop, even on the principles of our opponents. Therefore, wherever there is an *uninterrupted series* of true bishops, there is an *uninterrupted series of presbyters* also. The Lutheran church, the Reformed or Calvinistic churches of Germany, the re-

* Reeves's Translation, chap. iii.

formed French church, the church of Scotland, the Dissenters in general of Great Britain and Ireland, and the Wesleyan and Calvinistic Methodists, *are all governed by presbyters.* These had an uninterrupted succession from other presbyters. Those in the Scotch church, in the Lutheran church, &c., had an uninterrupted succession from the presbyters (bishops) of the Romish Church: those of the different Protestant churches in England, from the presbyters (bishops) of the Church of England. What these bishops were, by ecclesiastical or human arrangement, as distinct from *presbyters,* or REAL *scriptural bishops, adds* NO *validity* to their acts above presbyters. This we have already clearly proved. All they had of real Scriptural authority arose from any claim they might have to be considered as real Scriptural presbyters. All this authority passed to the presbyters of the above-mentioned churches by *uninterrupted succession* in their ordination. The *human* authority of a bishop does not effect the question at all. If an *uninterrupted succession* is worth any thing, it is, therefore, worth as much for presbyters as for bishops. The ministry, the ordinations, the administration of the sacraments, in all the above-mentioned churches, therefore, are, even on this ground, EQUALLY as *Scriptural, valid,* and *apostolical,* as the ministry, &c., of any episcopal church. But, if they have equal validity and apostolicity from the *argument of a succession* of persons, many of them have reason to thank God, on their own behalf, that they have MUCH MORE *evidence* of the *same* thing from the *personal piety* of their *ministers,* the *doctrines* they teach, the *discipline* exercised over their members, the *unsecularized* state of their churches, the *Scriptural character* of their various *ordinances,* and, above all, in the *conversion of sinners unto God.*

This EXCLUSIVE, *intolerant* scheme, then, of *apostolical succession* in *bishops* ALONE, as taught by these high Church divines, FALLS TO THE GROUND. It is a MONSTROUS FABRICATION, designed to support a system of *usurpation* over ministers and people; and to maintain a method of *excluding* from the *pale of Christianity* all who *do not submit to it.* It is Anglican Popery with many heads, set up in the place, and to accomplish the purposes, of the Popery of Rome. Let all true Protestants protest against it. Let

us contend for the succession of *faith* and *holiness* as the *only* infallible tests of a Christian church. For this let all the true members of the church of England contend, both ministers and people. The writer, for one, will then fervently pray that God may make them a thousand times as many more as they are at this day. The world is before us: the *faith* of the gospel must save it. It is adapted and designed for this purpose. May the preaching of this faith, by whomsoever and wheresoever, have free course and be glorified!

SECTION X.

NO SUFFICIENT HISTORIC EVIDENCE OF A PERSONAL SUCCESSION OF VALID EPISCOPAL ORDINATIONS.

In the close of the last section, we have shown that the proof of the EQUALITY, by *divine right*, of *bishops* and *presbyters*, is *fatal* to the *whole scheme* of high Church successionists: utterly destroying its *exclusive* character. Here we might safely rest the cause. But as pretensions are boldly avowed, by high Churchmen, of their ability to trace the *pedigree* of their *ordinations* through an *unbroken series* of apostolical bishops; and as they employ this topic for the purpose of intolerance, it may not be without interest, or utility either, if we examine this point also. Dr. Hook shall state their case: "The prelates who at the present time rule the churches of these realms, were validly ordained by others, who by means of an UNBROKEN SPIRITUAL descent of *ordination*, derived their mission from the apostles and from our Lord. This *continued descent* is EVIDENT TO EVERY ONE who chooses to investigate it. Let him read the *Catalogues of Bishops*, ascending up to the most remote period. *Our ordinations* descend in a direct UNBROKEN line from Peter and Paul, the apostles of the circumcision and the Gentiles. These great apostles successively ordained *Linus*, *Cletus*, and *Clement*, bishops of Rome; and the apostolic succession was regularly continued *from them to Celestine*, *Gregory*, and *Vitalianus*, who ordained Patrick, bishop for the Irish, and *Augustine*

and *Theodore*, for the English. And *from those times an uninterrupted series of valid ordinations* has carried down the APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION in our churches to the present day. There is not a *bishop*, *priest*, or *deacon* among us, who cannot, if he please, trace his *own spiritual descent* from St. Peter or St. Paul." *

I am perplexed to account for such statements as the above. I have investigated this subject, and I *solemnly declare* my belief that they are UTTERLY FALSE. My perplexity is, I say, how to account for them. I cannot, I do not, think that the authors of them mean to say what they *know* to be *false*. I suppose they *wished* them to be true; and, not having time to examine for themselves, *take them upon trust*, and give them at *second hand*. But then if we can find excuse for Dr. Hook's want of knowledge of his subject, his arrogance can have none. Let the reader carefully mark the tone of the doctor's Two Sermons on the Church and the Establishment. They are *full of arrogance and insolence to all other churches*—"The words of his mouth are smoother than butter, but war is in his heart: his words are softer than oil, yet are they drawn swords." "You will observe," says he, "*how important all this* is which I have now laid before you. Unless Christ be spiritually present with the ministers of religion in their services, those services will be VAIN. But the only *ministrations* to which he has PROMISED his presence, is, to those of the BISHOPS who are successors of the first commissioned apostles, and the OTHER CLERGY acting under THEIR *sanction* and by THEIR *authority*.

"I know the outcry which is raised against this—the doctrine of the Christian church for eighteen hundred years—I know the outcry that is raised against it by THOSE SECTS which can trace their origin no higher than to some celebrated preacher at the Reformation,—but I disregard it, because I shall, by God's help, continue to do, what I have done ever since I came among you, namely, declare the whole counsel of God, without regard to consequences or respect of persons, and, at the same time, as far as in me lies, *live peaceably* with all men." After perusing the preceding part of this Essay, the reader will clearly see how much confidence is to be

* Two Sermons, 3d edition, Leeds, 1837, pp. 7, 8.

placed in the doctor's assertion, that his doctrine of apostolical succession has been "the doctrine of the Christian church for eighteen hundred years." His *excommunication* of ALL *the Protestant churches in the world* from the pale of Christianity, except the Church of England, (for it is at these he points the finger of scorn—"THOSE SECTS which can trace their origin no higher than to some celebrated preacher at the Reformation,") is exactly in the spirit of the declaration of Froude, a leader of the Oxford Tract-men, quoted at page 148: "Really," says he, "I HATE the REFORMATION and the REFORMERS more and more." Yet all this baseless assertion, and this denunciation against all these Protestant churches, the doctor believes he makes "*by the help of God!*"—and, at the same time, he persuades himself that he endeavours "*to live peaceably with all men!!*"

Let it be understood that the writer of this Essay does not wish to undervalue the succession of pious pastors in any church: no, it ought to be a cause of gratitude to God, when he raises up and gives such men to his church. But God's gifts never bind his own hands from giving equally excellent men, in any age, to any church. However, the case is altogether different when those who arrogate the title of his ministers, corrupt the gospel, and absolutely forbid any one, without their sanction and sinful impositions, to preach it in a purer form. And, since the time of the apostles, this has been done repeatedly by pretenders to apostolical succession. Indeed, could this personal descent be made out with the completeness pretended, it would prove no *divine right* to any EXCLUSIVE claims to God's ordinances and blessings. *God never made it a requisite* in true ministers; and the man that attempts it, in order to exclude other churches from the pale of Christianity, is an enemy to the rights and to the peace of God's church. He may have deceived himself, and think otherwise; but such he is, and such he must be, till he abandon his scheme. No such descent, however, can be proved.

We will now proceed to show that there is NO SUFFICIENT HISTORIC EVIDENCE of this "direct unbroken line from Peter," &c. Every link of this evidence ought to be clear and strong. Dr. Hook says they are "*evident* to any

one who wishes to investigate the subject." But the very first links are all broken in pieces.

Eusebius is often appealed to with confidence by succession divines. He had the fairest opportunity for giving certainty to this subject up to his day, could certainty have been had. He wrote about A. D. 320. He had read every thing which remained by any or all of the fathers before him. The emperor Constantine the Great was his friend; so that he could not want facilities and means of information. One great end at which Eusebius aimed, was "to preserve from oblivion the *successions*, although not of all, yet of the most famous apostles of our Saviour in those churches which then were eminent and still renowned."*

Now let us hear his own account of the *certainty* he possessed on such subjects. He tells us, in this very chapter, that he had "to tread a solitary and untrodden way—and could *nowhere* find so much as the *bare steps* of any men who had *passed the same path before*, excepting only some *shows* and *tokens* divers *here* and *there* had left, particularly declaring of the times they lived in, holding forth *torches* as it were *afar off*, and lifting up their voices from on high, and calling as out of a watch-tower what way we ought to go, and how without error or danger to order our discourse." This is not a very luminous, certain path!—Then speaking of Paul and Peter, and the churches founded by them, he says, "Now how many and what sincere followers of them have been approved as sufficient to take the charge of those churches by them founded, it is not easy to say, except such and so many as may be collected from the words of St. Paul." This is honest; but it shows the folly of building our Christianity upon such an uncertain foundation; for St. Paul gives no succession lists; and even Eusebius hath nothing certain besides the words of St. Paul. He then proceeds to say, "Timothy is *reported* to have been the first that was chosen to the bishopric of the Ephesian church; as also Titus, of the churches in Crete." This is evidently guess-work in its origen, upon the foundation of St. Paul's having mentioned their names in connection with these two places; for Whitby acknowledges he "can find nothing

* Eccles. Hist., b. i, chap. i, English translation, Cambridge, 1683.

of this matter, as to Timothy and Titus being bishops of Ephesus and Crete, in any writer of the *first three centuries.*"* The thing refutes itself in Eusebius, as to Titus, by saying that he was bishop of the "churches," εκκλησιων, in the *plural*, in Crete. No such thing occurs in the earliest Christian writers as that of any man being bishop of *more* than *one* church, (*one* parish.) This was seldom, if ever, more than a single congregation. Timothy, the New Testament says, was an evangelist: most probably Titus was so too. No place of residence is mentioned as to either of them: it is likely they had none, but travelled anywhere under the direction of the apostles, to set in order in new churches the things that remained to be settled. All beyond this is doubtful: all contrary to it is false. Bishop Pearson, whom all Churchmen will allow to be unexceptionable authority, positively declares that Eusebius had *no archives* or diptychs to go by; and he says, the supposition that he had *Catalogues* of the Roman bishops is *utterly vain*—"*conjecturam vanissimam esse.*"† As to bishops of Rome, we shall immediately see that Eusebius is contradicted by others. *There is no certainty.*

Dr. H. adroitly slips by a difficulty of no small magnitude, by tracing his own spiritual descent from Peter *or* Paul, Linus, &c. "There is a πρωτον Ψευδος in this case lies at the bottom," says Dr. Cave, "it being generally *taken for granted*, that St. Peter was in a proper sense bishop of Rome, which yet I believe can never be made good."‡ It is a question *never* yet *settled*, whether *Peter ever was at Rome;* but all the authority there is for Linus, Cletus, and Clemens, as *links* in the chain, make them to have derived it *from Peter*, and *not from Paul*. Now Archbishop Cranmer says, "It is *not* even *certain* that *Peter ever was at Rome.*"§ The very learned Flacius Illyricus declares himself doubtful whether Peter ever was at Rome.‖ The learned Zanchius, another eminent reformer, has

* Whitby's Preface to the Epistle to Titus.

† Pearsoni Opp. Posth. de Successione, diss, i, cap. ii.

‡ Dr. Cave on the Government of the Ancient Church. pp. 9, 10, ed. 1683, 12mo. Lond.

§ Burnet's Ref., book ii, A. D. 1534.

‖ Catalog. Test. Ver., v. 1, pp. 484, 485, edit. secund.

shown enough to make any candid person stand in doubt on the same subject.*

However, suppose we grant this, and even reckon Peter the first bishop of Rome: then *who succeeded Peter? No man on earth can tell.* One mentions one person, another says it was another, and these the very witnesses who are cited to prove the point. "The fathers," says Dr. Dwight, "however sincere, and however satisfactory their testimony, concerning facts which passed under their own eyes, yet received traditionary accounts loosely; and both believed and recorded much of what took place *before their time* without truth or evidence." Bishop Taylor himself says, "the fathers were INFINITELY *deceived* in their account and enumeration of *traditions.*"† Now Tertullian, Rufinus, and Epiphanius, say *Clement succeeded Peter.* Jerome declares that "MOST of the Latin authors supposed the order to be *Clement* the *successor of Peter.*" But Irenæus, Eusebius, Jerome, and Augustine, *contradict* the above authorities, and say *Linus succeeded Peter:* Chrysostom seems to go the same way. Bishop Pearson has proved that Linus died before Peter; and therefore, on the supposition that Peter was first bishop of Rome, Linus could not succeed him. Cabassute, the learned Popish historian of the Councils, says, "It is a VERY DOUBTFUL *question* concerning Linus, Cletus, and Clemens, as to which of them succeeded Peter." Dr. Comber, a very learned divine of the Church of England, says, "Upon the whole matter, there is NO CERTAINTY who was bishop of Rome, *next to the apostles*, and therefore the ROMANISTS" (N. B., Romanists) "BUILD UPON AN ILL BOTTOM, when they *lay so great weight* on their PERSONAL SUCCESSION."‡

But who was the *third* bishop of Rome? for of the *second* there is no certainty to be had. Here the confusion is greater still. The Roman *Catalogues*—the Catalogues of high Churchmen—must have somebody, so they put Cletus in. Hear Dr. Comber again: "The LIKE BLUNDER there is about the next pope, [bishop of Rome,] the *fabulous Pontifical* makes *Cletus* succeed Linus, and gives us several Lives of *Cletus*, and *Anacletus*, making them of several

* Zanchius de Ecclesia, cap. 9.
† Liberty of Prophesying, sec. 5.
‡ Dr. Comber on "Roman Forgeries in Councils," part i, c. 1.

nations, and to have been popes at different times, putting Clement between them. Yet the aforesaid learned bishop of Chester [Pearson] PROVES these were ONLY TWO NAMES of the SAME PERSON; but the notes" (of the Popish editors of the Councils) "attempt to justify the *forged Pontifical*, by impudently affirming that Ignatius, (Anacletus's contemporary,) Irenæus, Eusebius, St. Augustine, and Optatus, were all mistaken, or all wronged by their transcribers, who leave out Cletus. But every candid reader will rather believe the mistake to be in the Pontifical, (which is a mere heap of errors,) and in the Roman Martyrology and Missal, which blindly followed it, rather than in those ancient and eminent fathers. And every one may see the folly of the Romish Church, which venerates two several saints on two several days, one of which never had a *real being;* for *Cletus* is but the *abbreviation of Anacletus's name.*"—Dr. Comber, *ut supra.*

It must be evident to every reader, that as Dr. Hook, &c., maintain the same unbroken line of bishops with the Roman Pontifical, Dr. Comber's remarks apply directly to their succession in common with that of the Papists. The Pontifical is the Romish book containing the lives and pretended decrees of the early popes, according to the opinion of the Church of Rome. Their Catalogues are generally made from it: it is justly denominated a FORGERY by Dr. Comber. What a triumphant succession! whose main authority is a forgery.*

Then *who was fourth* bishop of Rome? The Papists, Dr. Hook, &c., say Clement was. Dr. Hook does not distinctly make Peter bishop of Rome; but this makes no material difference. Now we have heard that Tertullian, Rufinus, Epiphanius, and, according to Jerome, "MOST of the LATIN authors," say he was *second* bishop, and succeeded next to Peter. Platina, the Popish biographer of the popes, a high authority in his way, says, that just before Peter's martyrdom, he appointed Clement to be bishop of Rome; and all this while he gives twenty-three years to the presidency of Linus and Cletus as preceding Clement in that bishopric. *Peter had been dead* twenty years

* That this *Pontifical* is a *forgery* is proved beyond a doubt by numerous authors: among others, see Howell's Pontificate, Dupin's Bibliotheca Patrum, Jewel's Defence.

when Clement is said to become bishop; and yet they say Peter made him bishop of Rome! Cabassute says, "*the whole question is very doubtful.*" Prideaux, a stanch and learned Churchman, says, "NO CERTAINTY is to be had." Howell, a thorough Churchman, and learned writer, after going at length into what he calls the *stupidity* and *fables* of the *Romanists* on this point, concludes:—"Here it is *evident how very doubtful* and *uncertain* is the *personal succession* of the Roman bishops." Dr. Comber concludes this point by remarking, that the stupidity and fable here are "a *sufficient proof* there is NEITHER TRUTH nor CERTAINTY in the pretended personal succession of the first popes." Dr. Hook must set his priests, curates, and deacons to work. Here is enough to do for the Rev. Mr. Ward, the Rev. Mr. Ayliffe Poole, &c., with the Rev. Dr. Hook to assist them.

Similar confusion is to be found in several succeeding parts. Platina, who had as good opportunity as any man to know the truth of history, as to the succession of the popes, &c., acknowledges that the authorities on the subject, in several of the following centuries, were full of confusion.* "And he complains," says Prideaux, "that they who were appointed as *prothonotaries* to *register* the passages in the church were in his time become so illiterate, that some of them could scarce write their own names in Latin." Fine *chroniclers!* on whose faithfulness and accuracy to place the existence of our Christianity! Prideaux remarks in another place, A. D. 858, that "Onuphrius, Platina, Ciaconius, complain much of the neglect of registering, [and] the confusion of their popes' lives, notwithstanding their succession is made such a convincing argument"

The ELECTIONS of the *bishops of Rome* increase the doubts of a serious inquirer here. They were, even *long before* the time of *Vitalianus*, such scenes of *intrigue, contention, violence,* and BLOODSHED, that there is far greater probability that, Scripturally speaking, the most orthodox and excellent person was thrown out, and a *heretic,* as Liberius, or a *murderer,* usurped the seat, than that any thing like a legitimate succession constantly took place.

Bishop Burnet shows that for about three hundred years

* See his Lives of Anicetus I., John XIII. and XV.

"the popes were made upon the emperors' mandates. Nor did the emperors part easily with this right, but, after that, the Othos and the Henrys kept up their pretensions, and came oft to Rome, and made many popes; and though most of the popes so made were generally anti-popes and schismatics, yet some of them, as Clement the Second, are put in the Catalogues"—the SUCCESSION—"of the Popes by Baronius and Binnius; and by the late publishers of the Councils, Labbee and Cossartius. There was indeed great opposition made to this at Rome; but let even their own historians be appealed to, what a SERIES of MONSTERS, and not men, those popes"—*succession bishops*—"were: how *infamously* they were *elected*, OFTEN BY THE WHORES OF ROME, and how flagitious they were, we refer it to *Baronius* himself, who could not deny this for *all his partiality* in his great work." * A fine *uninterrupted* "SERIES—of MONSTERS"—apostolical bishops—"elected *often by the whores of Rome!!*" A pretty SPIRITUAL DESCENT for high Church priests!!

As Cardinal Baronius was one of the greatest champions of Popery, his testimony to the wickedness employed in the ELECTION of the popes is above all exception. He says, speaking of the beginning of the tenth century, "O! what was then the face of the holy Roman Church! how filthy, when the *vilest* and *most powerful whores* ruled in the court of Rome! by whose arbitrary sway diocesses were made and unmade, bishops were consecrated, and—which is inexpressibly horrible to be mentioned!—FALSE POPES, THEIR PARAMOURS, were thrust into the chair of Peter, who, *in being numbered as popes serve no purpose* except to FILL UP THE CATALOGUES of the POPES of Rome. For who can say that persons thrust into the popedom without any law by whores of this sort were legitimate popes of Rome? In these elections no mention is made of the acts of the clergy, either by their choosing the pope at the time of his election, or of their consent afterward. All the canons were suppressed into silence, the voice of the decrees of former pontiffs was not allowed to be heard, ancient traditions were proscribed, the customs formerly practiced in electing the pope, with the sacred

* Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England, p. 50, 4to., second edition. Lond., 1688.

rites, and pristine usages, were all extinguished. In this manner, LUST, supported by secular power, excited to frenzy in the rage for domination, RULED IN ALL THINGS." His own words are—

"*Quæ tunc facies sanctæ Ecclesiæ Romanæ! quàm fædissima cùm Romæ dominarentur potentissimæ æquè et sordidissimæ meretrices! quarum arbitrio mutarentur sedes, darentur Episcopi, et quod auditu horrendum et infandum est, intruderentur in Sedem Petri earum amassii Pseudo-Pontifices, quæ non sint nisi ad consignanda tantum tempora in catalogo Romanorum Pontificum scripti. Quis enim à scortis hujusmodi intrusos sine lege legitimos dicere posset Romanos fuisse Pontifices? Nusquam Cleri eligentis, vel postea consentientis aliqua mentio. Canones omnes pressi silentio, decreta Pontificum suffocata, proscriptæ antiquæ traditiones, veteresque in eligendo Summo Pontifice consuetudines, sacrique ritus, et pristinus usus prorsus extincti. Sic vendicaverat omnia sibi libido, sæculari potentia freta, insaniens, æstro percita dominandi.*"*

We shall afterward show clearly that the English bishops frequently received their *ordination from Rome*, nearly down to the time of the Reformation. Dr. Hook and others wish to get over this point, and so to shun the abominations of the bishops and the Church of Rome, in the middle ages. The evidence is flatly against them. Consequently—

The SCHISMS of the popedom are another proof of the *impossibility* of tracing this "unbroken line" from Peter. Some of the Popish historians themselves, Onuphrius Panvinius for instance, grant that there had been above *twenty schisms* in the popedom before the end of the fourteenth century. Some of these schisms continued for *forty years*, and some longer. Sometimes *four* pretenders to the popedom existed at the same time; and the whole Church, the whole of Europe, was equally divided against itself. Now when two, three, or four pretended bishops of Rome laid claim to the chair at the *same time*, it is impossible that they could all be legitimate claimants to the same chair. It was generally contrived either to *depose*, or *banish*, or *poison*, or *murder*, one or more of them. Frequently the most cunning, the most powerful, the most

* Ann. Eccles., tom. x, p. 679, 1603, as cited by R. Southey, Esq., in his Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, p. 389. Lond., 1826.

warlike, or the most wicked of them, succeeded in deposing his less cunning, less powerful, less warlike, or less wicked opponent. For the proofs of all that is here said, let the reader peruse Platina's Lives of the Popes, Bishop Jewel's Apology, and the "Defense" of that Apology; as well as many other authorities of a like nature. Now, who can trace the *true succession*, when the *whole church* was divided *against itself? cardinals against cardinals, councils against councils*, and nations against nations? Could *faction*, and *poison*, and *murder*, and *wars* and *bloodshed*, which *alone decided* in these *schisms, could* THESE *settle the* TRUE *succession?* Answer, ye modern boasters about your spiritual descent through this *unbroken* line!

Dr. Wells, indeed, says, "The *plurality* of popes at the *same time* doth not *in the least* prejudice the succession of ordination: and your [Mr. Dowley's] thinking otherwise is only a proof of your not knowing, that the same person which is not a rightful pope, yet may be a rightful bishop; and, consequently, may have a just right to exercise the *power of ordination*, though he may not have a just right to exercise the *papal authority*, as received in the Church of Rome. And this consideration being of *universal extent*, I purposely pass by others, which might be urged in reference to our church in particular."* Now, to prevent any high Church doctor of divinity injuring the opinion of his "SUPERIORITY" over a *dissenting teacher*, it may not be amiss to give him the following information:—

1. That the translation of bishops from one see or bishopric to another, was prohibited by several important councils: as the council of Nice, can. 15: council of Antioch, A. D. 341, can. 21: council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, can. 5, and several others. This, therefore, as a rule, would prevent any individual *previously a bishop* from being elected bishop or pope of Rome.

2. That for nearly *a thousand* years it does not appear that any individual, *previously a bishop*, was elected bishop of Rome. During this time there had been *one hundred* bishops, or popes of Rome, and *thirteen* SCHISMS in the popedom; that is, there had been thirteen times two or three pretenders, at the same time, to the same chair or

* Dr. Wells' Answer to Mr. Dowley's Letter, p. 39, edit. 1716, 12mo. Lond.

bishopric. The man, therefore, who was a usurper as a pope, was no bishop; yet the succession comes through these numerous USURPERS and MURDERERS.

3. That, according to the general principles of the church, no man can be a bishop who was not *previously a presbyter:* all others were really no more than *laymen.* The consecration of a bishop was not ordination to the Christian ministry, but a mere ecclesiastical ceremony. Now, numbers of the bishops of Rome were nothing but *laymen* at their *consecration.* They never were, therefore, ordained to the Christian ministry. They had no Christian orders; of course they could not give what they had not. Yet the succession, the *spiritual descent of ordination,* comes through these *mere laymen* to our high Church clergymen; and to all who depend upon Popish succession, and Popish episcopal ordinations, for the validity of their ministry.

4. Several of these pretenders to the popedom being nothing but presbyters, were, after being elected bishops of Rome, *deposed as usurpers;* yet these mere *usurpers,* who never were really bishops, ORDAINED SEVERAL of the ENGLISH BISHOPS and ARCHBISHOPS, who, according to this scheme, continued for many years to give *false orders* to the BISHOPS and CLERGY in England. See the twelfth section, and the notes to the table of bishops there.

The EARLY HISTORY of the bishops of Rome abounds in *contradiction:* the *later records* are *all confusion:* the *elections* were frequently scenes of *bloodshed;* and the numerous *schisms* about the popedom were *interminable.* Therefore—

HISTORIC EVIDENCE of an "unbroken line of descent from Peter" down to the present bishops of England UTTERLY FAILS. The bold bravado is a FABLE; and is discreditable to those who make it.

SECTION XI.

NULLITY OF THE POPISH ORDINATIONS—CHARACTER OF THE POPISH CHURCH, AND POPISH BISHOPS, BEFORE AND AT THE REFORMATION.

We have seen the ROOT of this high Church scheme of Anglican Popery cut up in the proof of the *equality by divine right* of all Christian ministers; and, in the last section, the *boast* of an *unbroken line* of power to bind all consciences to that scheme has perished in the fire of probation. Another point remains to be a little more distinctly examined: it is the question of the *validity of Popish ordinations*. The spiritual descent of our high Church succession men essentially depends, among other things, upon the validity of Popish episcopal ordinations, before and at the Reformation. We shall show these Popish episcopal ordinations to have been no ordinations in a Scriptural sense; to have been *null* and *void* to all intents and purposes as ordinations to the Christian ministry. In this section, we will first give a brief character of the *Church* of Rome, and of the *bishops* of Rome, before the Reformation.

As to the CHURCH of ROME, the REFORMERS, with *one voice*, declared it to be ANTICHRIST, and guilty of IDOLATRY.

The Homilies of the Church of England are decisive as to the views of the English reformers. "Now, concerning excessive decking of *images and idols*, with painting, gilding, adorning with precious vestures, pearl and stone, what is it else, but for the further provocation and enticement to spiritual fornication, to deck spiritual harlots most costly and wantonly, which the IDOLATROUS CHURCH understandeth well enough. For she being indeed not only an HARLOT, (as the Scripture calleth her,) but also *a foul, filthy, old, withered harlot*, (for she is indeed of ancient years,) and understanding her lack of natural and true beauty, and great loathsomeness which of herself she hath, doth (after the custom of such harlots) paint herself, and deck and tire herself with gold, pearl, stone, and all

kinds of precious jewels, that she, shining with the outward beauty and glory of them, may please the foolish phantasie of fond lovers, and so entice them to spiritual fornication with her, who, *if they saw her*, (I will not say naked,) but in simple apparel, would abhor her as the foulest and filthiest HARLOT that ever was seen: according as appeareth by the description of the garnishing of the great strumpet of all strumpets, *the mother of whoredom*, set forth by St. John in his Revelation, who by her glory provoked the princes of the earth to commit whoredom with her." * "Wherefore it followeth, that there is like foolishness and lewdness in decking of our IMAGES AS GREAT PUPPETS FOR OLD FOOLS, like children, to play the wicked play of idolatry, as was before among the ethnicks and gentiles. Our churches stand full of such great puppets, wondrously decked and adorned: garlands and coronets be set on their heads, precious pearls hanging about their necks, their fingers shine with rings set with precious stones, their dead and stiff bodies are clothed with garments stiff with gold. You would believe that the images of our *men-saints* were some *princes* of Persia land with their proud apparel, and the idols of our *women-saints* were NICE and WELL-TRIMMED HARLOTS, *tempting their paramours to wantonness:* whereby the saints of God are not honoured, but most dishonoured, and their godliness, soberness, chastity, contempt of riches, and of the vanity of the world, defaced and brought in doubt their sober and godly lives. And because the whole pageant must thoroughly be played, it is not enough thus to deck idols, but at last come in the priests themselves, likewise decked with gold and pearl, that they may be *meet servants* for such lords and ladies, and fit worshippers of such gods and goddesses. And with a solemn pace they pass forth before these golden puppets, and *fall down* to the ground on their *marrowbones* before these honourable IDOLS, and then rising up again, offer up odours and incense unto them, to give the *people* an example of double idolatry, by worshipping not only the idol, but the gold and riches wherewith it is garnished. Which things the most part of our old martyrs, rather than they would do, or once kneel, or offer up one crumb of incense before an image, suffered most cruel and terrible

* Homily against Idolatry, third part.

deaths, as the histories of them at large do declare." * Such is the view given by the reformers of the Church of England, ratified by convocation, and established as the doctrine of the Church of England on this point. See the 35th article. Dr. Hook, the Oxford Tract-men, &c., have solemnly subscribed to this article, declaring that the Homilies "*contain godly and wholesome doctrine.*" And yet these men defame and hate the Reformation and the reformers, despise the name and the principles of Protestantism, and openly declare their design to form a *half-way house*, a "*via media*," between Popery and Protestantism!

Let us come to the *bishops of Rome*. In the Common Prayer, as published in the time of Edward VI., the following *petition* made part of the LITANY:—"From the tyranny of the bishop of Rome, and all his *detestable enormities*, good Lord deliver us." The *Convocation* at Dublin, 1615, says, "The *bishop of Rome* is so far from being the supreme head of the universal church of Christ, that his works and doctrine do plainly discover him to be the *man of sin*, foretold in Holy Scripture, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and abolish with the brightness of his coming."

The reformed church of France, in Synodo Papinsensi, article 31, says, "Whereas the Bishop of Rome having erected to himself a monarchy over the Christian world, doth usurp a dominion over all churches and pastors, and hath rose to such a height of pride, as to call himself God, will be adored, and all power to be given him in heaven and earth: disposeth of all ecclesiastical things: defines articles of faith, saith the authority of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of it, to be *from him*: maketh merchandise of souls, dispenseth with vows and oaths: institutes new worships of God. As also in *civil affairs, treads upon the lawful authority of the magistrate*, in giving, taking away, translating of empires: we do believe and assert him to be the *very proper antichrist*, SON OF PERDITION foretold in the word of God, the *scarlet harlot*, sitting on seven mountains in the great city; which hath obtained a rule over the kings of the earth; and we do expect when the Lord, according to his promise, and as he hath begun,

* Homily against Idolatry, third part.

will destroy him with the spirit of his mouth, and at length abolish with the brightness of his coming." *

See, in the same place, the authorities of the Waldenses, Wickliffe, Bishops Jewel, Abbot, Whitgift, Andrews, Bilson, Hall, Downham, Moreton, Davenant, and Prideaux; also Hooker, Arminius, &c., all declaring their belief that the Church and pope of Rome were antichrist.

As to the bishops and clergy of Rome, more distinctly, Fox, the martyrologist, says,—"And to begin first with the order and qualities of life, I ask here of this Roman *clergy*, where was this church of theirs which now is, in the ancient time of the primitive church of Rome, with this pomp and pride, with this riches and superfluity, with this *gloria mundi*, and name of cardinals, with this *prancing dissoluteness* and *whoring* of the *curtisans*, with this extortion, bribing, buying and selling of spiritual dignities, these annats, reformations, procurations, exactions, and other practices for money, this avarice insatiable, ambition intolerable, fleshly filthiness most detestable, barbarousness and negligence in preaching, promise breaking faithlessness, poisoning and supplanting one another, with such schisms and divisions, which never were more seen than in the elections and court of Rome THESE SEVEN HUNDRED YEARS, with such extreme cruelty, malice, and tyranny, in burning and persecuting their poor brethren to death?"

It would be endless to enumerate the *wickedness* of the *bishops* of *Rome: volumes* might be *filled* with the accounts of them from good authorities. How wonderful it must be to a simple-hearted Protestant, accustomed only to the teachings of the Scriptures, to learn that any persons calling themselves *ministers of a Protestant church*, should suppose that men so *monstrously wicked* should be able to communicate any *spiritual* blessings or *spiritual* authority to others! Yet such is the case with a certain class of the divines of the Church of England, who adopt such principles in order to maintain the figment of a personal succession of episcopal consecrations, &c. This makes it necessary to our argument, that we produce some authorities

* Certain discourses of Archbishop Usher's and Bishop Bedell's, published and enlarged by Nicholas Bernard, D. D., &c., pp. 143, &c., 12mo. London, 1659.

to show the true character of the bishops of Rome. We shall assert nothing but from authors of undisputed credit.

1. POPES MONSTERS IN WICKEDNESS.—"Pope Vigilius, A. D. 540," says Howell, "*waades* to the pontifical throne *through* his successors' [predecessors] *blood*." Platina says, "that when he was leaving Rome for Constantinople, the Roman people pelted him with sticks and stones, *loading* him with *curses* and reproaches as he went along: adding this execration, 'According to the evils which thou hast committed against the Roman people, may evil come upon thy own head!'" He was conveyed to Constantinople to answer for himself. While there, he was in the presence of the empress, nearly beaten to death. He fled into the temple of Euphemia. "From this he was driven by force, and was then dragged through the whole city with *a rope round his neck like a thief*," says Platina, "until evening. He died at Syracuse, on his way back to Rome." Pope Pelagius was obliged to clear himself of the *suspicion of murdering Vigilius*, by swearing his innocence upon the crucifix and the gospels. Howell, in this place, "*challenges the world to produce, either from sacred or profane story, any one series, generation, or order of men to this day, that has been guilty of such failings, weakness, unsteadiness, cruelty, &c., as they have.*"* Boniface III. became pope A. D. 606. This man obtained the popedom of Phocas, who had *murdered* Mauritius, the emperor, and had become emperor in his place. Boniface contended with the patriarch of Constantinople about the title of "universal bishop." To end this controversy, he obtained the point, that the bishop of Rome *alone* should be called *papa* or *pope*, (a term before that time common to all bishops,) and the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, were henceforward to be distinguished by the name of *patriarch*. Here we find the pope *lording* it over the *whole* church. Accordingly, Prideaux reckons this Boniface as the *first* of what he terms "*usurping Nimrods;*" and the beginning of "*the kingdom of the beast*," Rev. xiii. So Flacius Illyricus, who reckons thirty-nine popes in this "kingdom" up to John VIII. Mohammed, the false prophet, arose about this time, along with the kingdom of the beast, as another curse to the church.

* Pontificate, p. 88.

Pope Constantine, A. D. 707, envied the independence of the archbishop of Ravenna, who claimed equality with the bishop of Rome. Indeed, the Popish historians grant that the exarchs of Ravenna had been accustomed even to confirm the election of the pope. By means, however, of Justinian, the emperor, Pope Constantine, obtained the subjugation of Felix, the archbishop of Ravenna. "The city was taken by siege, and the archbishop's *eyes were put out with a red hot concave brazen vessel.*"

The popes Constantine, Gregory II., &c., distinguished themselves in favour of *image worship*. In this controversy, they *excommunicated* the emperors of the East: forbade their subjects to pay the accustomed taxes or tribute; and actually *severed* the states of the West from their *allegiance* to the emperor. They then managed to set the subordinate governors of the West against each other, in order to destroy all that opposed their ambitious schemes. All the facts of the case are acknowledged and defended by Platina and Ciaconius. In this way they managed to have the *exarchate* of Ravenna *destroyed*, because the exarch and the archbishop withstood the ambition of the pope and Church of Rome. The king and kingdom of Lombardy shared the same fate; and most of the cities and territories of these states were given, by the governors of France, to the pope; and the pope (Leo III.) in return, *set up* Charles the Great, or Charlemagne, *as emperor* of the West, for the professed purpose of making him the *defender* of the *popedom*; so says Ciaconius.* What successors of the apostles! *dethroning* sovereigns, and setting up others against them: encouraging their *subjects* in *rebellion:* prohibiting custom: *destroying kingdoms*, and spreading *war* and *bloodshed* throughout Europe, to gratify their own ambition, and for the purpose of defending the *worshipping of images;* and this at the very time when the Mohammedan conquerors were making this *image worship* a ground of the devastations they were bringing upon the Christian church at large!

We now come to the history of *Pope Joan*. Some learned Protestants have good-naturedly given up this history; and we are not going to contend about it. Yet we may say, without any fear of contradiction, that Papists

* Page 226, ed. Romæ, 1601.

hold *a thousand* things as true, for which they have *not half* the evidence that there is for the *fact*, that there actually was A FEMALE in disguise *elected* and *confirmed as Pope John VIII.*: "that," says Platina, "she became *with child* by some of those about her; and that she *miscarried and died* in her way to the Lateran church, or temple." Platina says, also, that her "pontificate lasted one year, one month, and four days." He remarks that the authors who state these things were *obscure;* yet he acknowledges that, in his day, "*almost every body affirmed them to be true,*"—"*fere omnes affirmant.*" Prideaux declares that there are *fifty* authorities belonging to the Church of Rome in favour of it. Flacius Illyricus *gives authorities* at considerable length; and shows, from the testimonies of authors living near the times, and henceforward for several hundreds of years, that during that time it was never doubted; and the authors who mention it were *Italians,* relatives of popes, &c.* If *half* of the history of Popery, then, has any truth in it, there was really *a female* strumpet, as a *link* in this chain, as a *progenitrix* in this *spiritual descent* of Popish priests, Oxford Tract-men, Dr. Hook, &c.!!

Martin II., A. D. 883, raises a sedition, it is said, against Pope John, throws him into chains, and forces him to flee for his life. Hadrian III., A. D. 884, "was a person of great promise," says Ciaconius, "but was taken away by Heaven to make way for the *degenerate popes* who followed, and who were sent as a *judgment* for the abounding sins of the people, and the world, at that time." What a holy line! Stephen VI., Howell says, is called by Labbe, the celebrated editor of the Councils, "the *most wicked* of men; and that he is *reckoned* in the Papal Catalogue,"—the *succession*,—"to prevent the danger of schism." "But," says Labbe, "though Pope Stephen was *so wicked* a man, the heretics ought not to insult us against the promise of Christ made to St. Peter and his church; for all that Stephen said or did against Pope Formosus, were mere acts of *phrensy or fury;* but as he was lawfully invested with the pontifical authority, he could not err against the *faith and good morals.*" The pontifical authority, then, is authority to be the *wickedest* of men,

* See Catalogus Testium Veritatis, vol. ii, pp. 179–189, ed. 1597.

without ERRING against *faith* and *good morals!* What words can describe the abominations of this system!!

Theodorus II. is represented by Platina as "*seditious:*" John X. as "*idle and worthless;*" and the rest, then about, as "*lascivious.*" Christopher throws his predecessors into prison, with great *tumult, sedition,* and the *loss of many lives.* "In so vitious a state," says Platina, "was the pontifical authority then, that a private person could, by violence and faction, seize it in a moment." He calls this pope Christopher "*a wolf.*" The short lives of many of the popes about this time he interprets as a proof that God, in *judgment,* removed them quickly, as "CERTAIN MONSTERS—*tanquam monstra quædam,*" out of the way. Platina says that Clement II., A. D. 1048, was *poisoned* with poison, prepared, as it was supposed, by his successor, Pope Damasus II."* "This Damasus," says he, "invaded the chair by *force.* And this had become so ESTABLISHED A CUSTOM that any ambitious individual had the liberty of *invading Peter's seat.*"† Here are apostolical successors! And even earlier than this, in the life of Benedict IV., A. D. 898, he says, "the chair of Peter was USURPED, rather than possessed by, MONSTERS of WICKEDNESS, ambition and bribery." The whole passage is instructive, and deserves insertion. Speaking about the decline of the Roman empire, and the decay of its glory, through *idleness* and *effeminacy,* brought in by *luxury,* he says, "the same thing happened to the Papal dignity. The glory of the popedom was acquired by holiness of life, and the purity of doctrine of the bishops of Rome, accompanied with the severest toils, and the most consummate virtue, in their proceedings; by these means, and without the wealth and pomp of the world, it daily increased amidst the most hostile and obstinate persecutors of the Christian name; but as soon as the church began to wanton with wealth, her members forsaking their former strictness of living, turned to a general licentiousness of conduct. All civil restraint being removed, a general license of sinning everywhere prevailed. Hence *these* MONSTERS of wickedness, by whom the most holy chair of Peter was, through their *intrigues* and *bribes,* rather USURPED than possessed."

* Platina in Vita Clem. II. † In Vita Dam. II.

Sergius III., A. D. 903, "rescinded the acts of Pope Formosus, *compelled* those whom he had ordained to be *reordained*, dragged his *dead body* from the sepulchre, *beheaded him as though he were alive*, and then *threw him into the Tiber!*—See," says Platina, "what a degenerate race! They seek the *pontificate by bribes*, and having obtained it, they *cast behind them all regard to the worship of God*, and contending with each other like the *most ferocious tyrants*, that they may reign alone: afterward, none being left that can restrain them, they give themselves up to take their fill in voluptuousness and licentiousness." *

A. D. 931. "The next," says Howell, "that takes the chair, is one whom they ought to call a *devil*, instead of pseudo-pope; and yet he must be inserted in the *Catalogue* of the Popes; though, according to their own confession, the *vilest, blackest monster* that ever yet defiled the holy purple. This was Pope John IX., son of Pope Sergius III., by the strumpet Marozia, (a blessed stock to take an infallible guide from,) by whose means he was intruded into the place of Stephen VII., though besides all other impediments, he was incapable of that high office in the church through want of years. This pontificate was a *series* of *debaucheries*, *incest*, &c., which would offend the modest reader to repeat." †

"John XIII.," I quote Platina, "*usurped* the pontificate. From his youth up he had been *contaminated with every vice*, and all *iniquity;* and if any of his time was spared from his *libidinous* pursuits, it was rather given to *hunting* than to prayer. A council of the bishops of Italy was called by the emperor that they might judge of the life of this MOST *wicked* of men. The pope, fearing the judgment of right-minded men, flies into the forest, and lies hid for some time in the woods, *like a wild beast*. The emperor departing, his friends recall him, [the pope,] but he is supposed to have perished by the judgment of God, lest the church should be ruined by the sedition arising on the subject. Some say that this *most iniquitous* man, or MONSTER *rather*, perished by being stabbed as taken in the act of *adultery*." Such is Platina's account of this *progenitor* of high Church bishops and priests!!

The scene becomes darker still through the following

* Vita Sergii. III. † Pontificate, p. 188.

centuries. But the reader has had enough for proof of the point before us. It would be tedious and disgusting to wade through the filth of their proceedings. Platina, as we have seen, expressly calls some of them "MONSTERS;" and says, "they *left* no WICKEDNESS unpractised." Pope Sixtus IV. *licensed brothels at Rome.* Pope Alexander VI., A. D. 1492, is thus designated by Howell:—"We are now to come to one of the *greatest* and *horriblest monsters* in *nature* that could scandalize the holy chair. His *beastly morals*, his immense ambition, his insatiable avarice, his detestable cruelty, his furious lusts, and monstrous incest with his daughter Lucretia, are at large described by Guiccardine, Ciaconius, &c."* He that wishes to see more, may be wearied with the detail in the authorities mentioned; and also in Bishop Jewel's Apology and his Defence.

POPES HERETICS.—Indeed, if ever there were any heretics I think it would be easy to prove that the WHOLE POPEDOM IS ONE CONTINUED HERESY. To be sure the Church of Rome has always held the doctrine of the trinity; so have thousands who have been denominated heretics. But while the Church of Rome has held that glorious doctrine in words, it has maintained in word and deed so *many pernicious* ERRORS *along with it;* and has given such paramount importance to these errors, as by them to *corrupt the whole gospel.* The *popedom* has been the *man of sin*, the *son* of *perdition*, and *antichrist:* the Church of Rome has been the "*great whore*" which has corrupted the nations: this has been the solemn view of those best acquainted with the subject. The smatterers, and sciolists, and credulists, and liberalists of our day are schoolboys compared with such men. They are the betrayers of Protestantism. They are more allied in spirit to Babylon than they are to the New Jerusalem.

The Papists acknowledge that Pope Liberius *subscribed Arianism, communicated with Arians*, and consented to the banishment of Athanasius—that he unhappily and *basely fell:* † that Athanasius, Hilary, and Jerome, all counted him a heretic, is acknowledged by Morinus, De Ordinationibus, part ii, p. 284. Pope Marcellinus *sacrificed to idols.*

* Pontificate, pp. 512–514.
† Vid. Howell's Pontificate, p. 43.

"He denied the fact," says Cabassute, "until he was convicted on indubitable evidence." Seventy-two witnesses testified to the fact. They say it was through fear that he did it, in a time of persecution; but so many things have been fabricated to wipe off this stain, that one can be sure of nothing about them. Here, on the *heresy* of the *popes*, I will quote Bishop Jewel: "Pope *Honorius* was condemned for *a heretic* in two *general councils*. In the council of Constantinople, the words of his condemnation be alleged thus: 'We have caused Honorius, the late *pope* of old *Rome* to be *accursed;* for that in *all things* he followed the mind of Sergius, *the heretic*, and confirmed his wicked doctrines.' In the very legend of Hilarius, it is mentioned that *Pope Leo* was an *Arian heretic*. In a synod holden at Rome against Pope Hildebrand, it is written thus: '*Incendio tradidimus Decreta eorum Haretica:*'—'We have burnt their heretical decrees.' Pope Sylvester II. was made pope by *necromancy*, and in recompense thereof, *promised both body and soul unto the devil.* The council of Basil condemneth Pope Eugenius by these words: 'We condemn and depose *Pope Eugenius*, a despiser of the holy canons: a disturber of the peace and unity of the church of God: a notorious offender of the whole universal church: a simonist: a forsworn man (*perjurum:*) a man uncorrigible: a *schismatic:* a man fallen from the faith, and a wilful heretic.' Now if idolaters, Montanists, Arians, Monothelites, Nestorians, deniers of the immortality, simonists, sorcerers, maintainers of filthiness, and other obstinate and wilful heretics may err, then—it is easily seen that the pope may err."

"Verily the council of Basil saith thus: 'It is reported and read that many popes have fallen into errors and heresies: it is certain that the popes may err: the council hath oftentimes condemned and removed the pope, in respect as well of his heresy in faith, as of his lewdness in life.'"*

POPES SIMONIACS.—The evidence of this would *fill a volume*. Platina states it repeatedly, that the PONTIFICATE was obtained by the BASEST PURCHASE.† Dr. Whitby

* Defence of the Apology, part vi, p. 536, &c., ed. 1609.

† Vid. Platina de Vitis. Pontif., pp. 75, 79, 88, 103, 125, 126, 137, 139, 143, 147, 149, &c., &c., fol. ed. Colon., 1562.

gives the following authorities as to the eleventh century: "Glaber, the monk, informs us, that the emperor, Henry II., having convened all his archbishops and bishops in France and Germany, told them, 'that *all ecclesiastical degrees*, even from the *popedom* to the *doorkeepers*, were *oppressed* with *damnable simony*, and that this *spiritual robbery* obtained in all places; and that the bishops, not being able to deny this charge, fled to the emperor's mercy, who said to them, Go your way, and what you have unlawfully obtained, endeavour to dispose of well.'"

CENTURY 12.—St. Bernard, in his commentary on Psalm xix, saith, 'that the offices of ecclesiastical dignity are turned into *filthy lucre* and *a work of darkness*.' In his oration of the conversion of St. Paul, he adds, 'that now *all ecclesiastical degrees* are *given* as an occasion of *filthy lucre*.' In his Book of Considerations, written to Pope Eugenius, he insinuates, that 'ambitious, covetous, *sacrilegious, simoniacal, incestuous persons, fornicators*, and such like *monsters of mankind, flowed* from *all parts* of the world to Rome, that by the *apostolical authority* they either might obtain, or keep ecclesiastical honours,' and puts this question to the pope, 'Who is there of that whole great city, who received thee *as a pope*, without the intervention of some *price*, or hopes of some *price?*' 'these,' saith he, 'are rather PASTORS of DEVILS, than of sheep.'"

"CENTURY 13.—Matthew Paris, speaking of the miserable state of the Church of England, saith, 'then simony was committed without shame.'"

"CENTURY 14.—Marsilius of Padua, saith, 'that men ignorant of the Holy Scriptures, undisciplined, and *notoriously criminal*, were placed in the *highest thrones of the church by simony;* that they who have visited the *Church of Rome*, may see plainly, and they who were never there, may learn from an *infinite number of men of credit*, that it is become *a receptacle* of *all rogues and trickers*, for all wares both spiritual and temporal. For what is there but a *concourse of simoniacs* from all places.'"*

Prideaux, whose work was revised and published by his uncle, the learned bishop of Worcester, numbers among the popes "thirty-eight *usurping Nimrods:* forty *luxurious Sodomites:* forty *Egyptian magicians:* forty-one *devouring*

* Whitby's Sermons, No. 11, Appendix, 8vo.

Abaddons: twenty *incurable Babylonians.*"* Prideaux was a stanch churchman. A few extracts from him will show the reader his opinion more in detail. We have seen that he acknowledges "*no certainty* is to be had" as to the *personal succession* of the early bishops of Rome; and, in the close of section 3, he asks, "whether that *succession* may conduce to the pope's supremacy, which *faultereth* and FAILETH in the *first* FOUNDATION?" Dr. Hook keeps hold of Rome up to Vitalianus. Now it is somewhat ominous that Vitalianus is the very pope in whose reign, as Prideaux remarks, the *number of the beast*, 666, was completed. His words are:—"Theodorus, a Greek, and one Hadrian, an African, are sent hither into England by him to bring in the *Latin* service, *being the year* 666, *just the number of the* BEAST; of which the word λατεινος and εκκλησια ιταλικα (by Baleus's reckoning) give a shrewd account." This Theodore was made archbishop of Canterbury, and brought into England the service of the beast, if Prideaux and Bale were right. Through him Dr. Hook traces his spiritual descent. "Here, *about the year* 666, (the number of the apocalyptical beast,) Phocas, the parricide, that slew his master Mauritius: Boniface, [pope,] the purchaser of supremacy of that villain by *simony;* and Mohammed, the grand impostor, break forth together."† "Boniface VII," Baronius saith, "was rather A THIEF, A MURDERER, and a TRAITOR to his country, than a pope."‡ His inquiries at the end of section 7, are such as the following:—"Whether *Marozia's* and her daughter's *pope-making* discovereth not the skirt of the whore of Babylon? Whether bastards, bribers, and atheists may be acknowledged for Christ's vicars, or St. Peter's successors? Whether Boniface VII., robbing the church treasury, and purchasing with it afterward the *popedom*, which he had forfeited, include not in it *sacrilege* and *simony?*"§ Again: "Now comes Hildebrand, the Hetrurian, (A. D. 1075,) under the name of Gregory VII., without any election of emperors or clergy, but only by his own intrusion. *He* had *poisoned* some *six or seven popes*, by Brazutus, before he could get the popedom himself."‖ In concluding section 8,—"In the compass of this period

* Introduction for reading Histories, p. 67. † Page 99.
‡ Page 108. § Page 110. ‖ Pages 117, 118.

are found, besides a knot of conjurors, and *poisoners, a crew of devilish rebels, abusing religion to varnish their damnable designs.*" Maximilian, (A. D. 1510,) the emperor, was wont to say, "O eternal God, if thou shouldest not watch over us, how ill would it go with the world which we govern? I, a miserable hunter, and that *drunkard and wicked* [pope] *Julius.*"*

Such are the men, "the *monsters,*" who, according to the principles of Popery, are "*the rock*" upon which the church of Christ is built, and against it, *as so built,* the gates of hell are never to prevail:—such are the men, "the *monsters,*" who are believed to be the successors of St. Peter, and the VICARS of Christ, to which *monsters* Popery says, Christ has given supreme power over the whole church upon earth:—such are the men, "the *monsters,*" through whom our high Churchmen trace their *spiritual descent! Their glory is their shame.*

SECTION XII.

POPISH ORDINATIONS OF ENGLISH BISHOPS BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

THE reader will keep in mind that the particular point now before us is, the NULLITY of *Popish ordinations* of English bishops before the Reformation. In the last section was exhibited a brief view of the monstrous wickedness, heresy, and simony of the popes themselves. The popes were the head and origin of episcopacy in those times. The master of the house at that time was, indeed, Beelzebub: what then was his household, the bishops under him, and derived from him? In this section we shall show that the episcopal ordinations in the English Church came through this "*series of monsters,*" the popes of Rome. Sometimes this is denied; and an attempt is made to claim a better line of succession through the ancient British bishops. We shall briefly state the matter of the British bishops, and then pass on to the proof of the point proposed in this section.

* Page 143.

The first planting of Christianity in Great Britian is involved in impenetrable obscurity. The earliest authentic mention of bishops in Great Britain is A. D. 359. The Saxons came over about A. D. 450. They were enemies to Christianity, and established idolatry on its ruins in a great part of the island. Gildas (who wrote about A. D. 564) gives a shocking account of the wickedness of all ranks, and of the misery of the country in his days. He speaks of "bishops *or* presbyters," several times. It is somewhat remarkable, that he never, I believe, uses the conjunction copulative, *and;* but always, I think, the disjunctive, *or*—"bishops *or* presbyters," as though at that time, in England, one was understood to imply the other. The English reformers, in their account of the divine institution of bishops and priests, frequently do the same; and expressly declare, individually, that they believe them to be one and the same office. Whatever they were in Gildas's time, none need covet succession from them. Gildas expressly calls them—the *whole priesthood*—"*children of the devil, who had merely the name of priests, but whose office, vilely bought, never could benefit any: whose blessing was a curse;* and *whose basely-bought ordination was a devilish delusion.*"* But these are not the British bishops alluded to. The bishops intended in this question derived their ordination from Columba and his coadjutors. The most authentic history, and indeed almost the only authentic history, of these bishops, is found in Bede's Church History of those times. Bede was an Englishman, and wrote about A. D. 731. The following is the statement he gives us about Columba and his coadjutors:—"Columba was the first preacher of Christ's faith to the Pictes, dwelling beyonde the greate mountaines northward, and the first founder of a monastery in the Ile Hu, which was had in great reverence and estimation a long time, both of the Scottes [that is, Irish] and of the Pictes."† "Columban came to Britannie when the most puissaunt King Bride, Meilocheus's sonne, reigned over the Redshanks [Picts] in the ninth yere of his raigne, and did by

* Gildas de Excidio Brit., pp. 72, &c., Lond. 1838.

† Bede's Church History, b. v. chap. 10, Dr. Stapleton's translation, printed at St. Omers, 1622, 12mo. For proofs that the term *Scots* meant the Irish, see Bishops Usher and Lloyd.

his learning and example of life conuert *that nation* to the faith of Christ, in consideration whereof the aforsaide Ile was geuen him in possession to make a monasterie; for the Ile is not greate, but as though it were fiue families by estimation. His successours kepe it until this day, where also he lieth buried, dying at the age of 77 yeres, about thirty-two yeres after that he came into Britanny, to preach. But before that he travailed to Britannie, he made a famous monasterie in Ireland, which for the great store of okes, is in the Scottish [Irish] tong called *Dearmach;* that is to say, a filde of okes: of both which monasteries *very many more* religious houses were afterward erected by his scholars, both in Britannie, and also in Ireland, *of all* which, the same abbey that is in the Ile where in his bodie lieth buried, is the *head* house. This Ile is *alwayes* wont to haue an abbot that is a priest [presbyter] to be the RULER: to whom both the wholle countrey, and *also the bishops themselves*, ought, after a strannge and unaccustomed order, *to be subject*, according to the example of the first teacher, who was NO *bishop*, but a priest [*presbyter*] and monke."* "The report is, that when King Oswald desired first to haue a PRELATE out of Scotland," (the province of the Scots or Irish,) "who might preach the faith to him and his people, an other man of a more austere stomacke was first sent: who, when after a litell while preaching to the English nacion, he did nothing prevaile, nor yet was willingly heard of the people, he returned into his countrey, and in the *assembly of the* ELDERS he made relacion, how that in his teaching he could do the people no good to whom he was sent, for as much as they were folks that could not be reclaymed, of a hard capacitie, and fierce of nature. Then the ELDERS (as they say) began in *counsaile* to treate at large what were best to be done, being no lesse desyrous that the people should attayne the saluation which they sought for, then sory that the preacher whom they sent was not receiued. When Aidan (for HE *also was present at the counsaile*) replyed *against the* PRIEST of whom I spake, saying, 'Me thinkes, brother, that you haue bene more rigorous then reason would with that unlearned audience, and that you haue not, according to the apostle's instruction, first giuen them milke of milde

* Book iii, chap. 4.

doctrine, vntill being by little and little nourished and weaned with the worde of God, they were able to vnderstand the more perfect misteries, and fulfill the greater commandements of God.' This being sayed, al that were at the assembly, looking vpon Aidan, pondered diligentlie his saying, and *concluded* that he aboue the rest was worthie of *that* charge and *bishopricke*, and that he should be sent to instruct those vnlearned paynims: for he was founde to be chiefely adorned with the grace of discretion, the mother of all vertues. THUS *making him bishop*, THEY sent him forth to preach—*sic que illum ordinantes ad prædicandum miserunt.*"*

Such is the account in Bede. From this the reader will observe, that the abbot in Columban's time was a presbyter, and *no* bishop: that this presbyter was the RULER of the monastery: that to this presbyter "the whole country, and also the *bishops* themselves, ought, after a strange and unaccustomed order, to be *subject*." Again, he will remark, that, in Aidan's being made bishop, the thing is done by a *company of* SENIORS, elders, or PRESBYTERS. This company sent another person as a PRELATE before Aidan, who had little or no success. He returned into the convent. His conduct becomes the subject of deliberation and debate; and Aidan, *one of the counsel*, BEFORE he himself was bishop, reads him a lecture on his mismanagement—a proof that he considered himself at least *his equal* in authority and jurisdiction. He addresses him also as a mere "priest" or presbyter—his office of bishop having expired, it seems, on his failing in the mission for which they had given it him. The other part of the elders, pleased with the piety and discretion of Aidan, immediately determine that he should be sent forth on this mission instead of the former, to instruct the ignorant and unlearned, "and THUS *ordaining him*, THEY SENT him forth to preach—SIC *que illum ordinantes ad prædicandum miserunt.*" Now the inquiry is, who ordained and sent forth Aidan to preach? "Who!" the unbiased reader will reply—"well the *company of seniors*, elders, or presbyters, to be sure! for they are the persons, and they *only*, of whom Bede speaks in the passage." So we think the reply must ever be made by every unprejudiced reader of Bede. There is

* Book iii, chap. 5.

not a syllable about any bishop or bishops being required, with some authority and power superlatively above these seniors, and without which it would have been sacrilege to ordain Aidan bishop. There is nothing in the history of these monasteries, abbots, and bishops, that supports such a supposition. The "council of seniors," with the abbot, who was a presbyter, made and sent forth these bishops. The abbot, "a presbyter and *no* bishop," *ruled* all these bishops when they were made. It is clear, then, that these bishops were all ordained and sent forth in their *origin* by presbyters. *The stream cannot rise above its fountain:* their own orders were presbyterian: all the orders others derived from them must, therefore, be presbyterian also. *All these British bishops, then, were presbyterian, and all orders derived from them were presbyterian orders.* There is one fact mentioned by Bede which strengthens this conclusion. At the consecration of a bishop, named Chadda, Bishop Wini was assisted by two British bishops. Bede says,* that, "besides this Wini, there was not any true bishop and *rightly consecrated—canonicè ordinatus*—in all Britanny." This was about A. D. 666. Theodore was made archbishop of Canterbury about 668. This Theodore was very learned in canonical matters. In his visitations, the matter of Chadda's consecration came under his notice, and he "*reproved* Chadda for that he was *not rightly consecrated*—and he did himself supplie and render complete his consecration after the right and due catholic manner—*ordinationem ejus denuò catholica ratione consummavit*"—he ordained him over again. Now why was this reordination, but because he considered there was something in the case of the two British bishops that, according to the canons, rendered their ordinations irregular? And what was this, but their deriving their ordination from presbyters? And, *canonically speaking* this was irregular. High Churchmen are welcome to this admission. But, then, the fact of these British bishops having, in their origin, presbyterian ordination, seems undeniable. Bishop Lloyd ineffectually endeavoured to disprove this.

These men of God had laboured twenty years, and with great success, *before* ever the monk *Austin* set foot in *Britain*. It is a mysterious providence that that ambitious,

* Book iii, chap. 28.

persecuting, and corrupting church, (for such it even then was,) should have been allowed to oppress and scatter a church so much superior in gospel truth and holiness. Austin failed in argument and authority to overcome the British bishops and divines. He threatened their destruction in a pretended prophecy, and, it is supposed on rather strong grounds, that he procured war to be made upon them, in which it is reported "that there were slain of them who came to pray, [presbyters,] *about a thousand and two hundred men,* and only fifty escaped by flight."* Bishop Jewel, Archdeacon Mason, and others, show that it is probable *Austin* was at the bottom of this horrible slaughter of these holy men and ministers of God's people. Dr. Hook, like many others, more inclined to the Popery and pageantry of Rome than to the apostolic simplicity and piety of the British bishops, misleads his readers in his representation of Austin's success. Archdeacon Mason has shown, by a careful and laborious deduction, that he "was *not* the apostle of this island, not of the Britons, not of the Scots, not of the Picts, not of the Angles, not of the Saxons, not of all the Jutes, *but of Kent alone.*"†

King James, I think it was, remarked that episcopacy was the *religion of kings.* Rome has long known this; and that church therefore has been noted for "*committing fornication with the kings of the earth.*" This was exemplified in the period we are upon. The Romish bishops flattered the kings: the kings flattered the Romish bishops. They united, therefore, to drive away the simple, pious, and uncorrupted laborious British bishops. This they completely effected; and the curse of Popery rested upon the country for many ages because of this sin. *All the English bishops henceforward became Popish, and not a British bishop remained.*‡

* Bede, book ii, chap. 2.

† Vid. Masoni Vind. Eccl. Anglican., lib. iv, cap. 4, ed. 1638, Lond.

‡ "It had been much better if the English had received Christianity from the Britains, if it had not been below conquerors to be taught by those whom they had subdued. For they would have delivered this religion to us, without making us SLAVES to the POPE, whose *creature Austin was*; and the British were aware of this, and therefore opposed him, and adhered to their old customs of Easter, and baptizing in a manner somewhat different from that of Rome, and they continued their former practice in the year 731, when Bede finished his history; but

We shall not leave this without proof. For the *strange confidence* with which the *most unfounded statements* are sometimes made, on the other side, makes it *necessary to be almost tedious in authorities.* I hope and believe such things are often done in ignorance. Many of these persons have so haughty an air in their statements, as to merit a severe rebuke for their insolent attempts at *superiority* on their baseless assumptions. Our proofs shall be taken from Bishop Godwin's Lives of the English Bishops. I use the edition of 1743, revised and corrected by Dr. Richardson, master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and canon of Lincoln Cathedral.

We begin with the archbishops of Canterbury. Ecclesiastical rule and practice commonly connected the archbishop with the ordinations of all the bishops in his province. The pope, as supreme and above all law, frequently interfered with this; but this interference of the pope will not alter the case as to the *purity* of English ordinations. To make the matter as brief and clear as I can, I will throw it into the form of a table. It might be greatly enlarged; but the metropolitan sees, and a few others, will suffice.

ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

A. D.	*Names of the Bishops and Archbishops.*	*Where and by whom ordained.*	*Years of Episcop.*	*Pages in Godwin.*
668	Theodore.....	Rome, Pope Vitalian.....	22	 41
735	Northelm.....	Rome, Pope Gregory III.....	5	 44
763	Lambert.....	Rome, Pope Paul I.....	27	 46
891	Plegmund.....	Rome, Pope Formosus (*a*).....	26	 48

---

in a short time after, the Welsh as well as the English became ENTIRELY ROMANISTS."—*Johnson's Clergyman's Vade Mecum*, vol. i, p. 34, 4th edition, 1715.

(*a*) "Every body knows the history of Pope Formosus. Stephen VI., his successor, at the head of his council, having declared the *ordinations* which he had administered *void*, caused all those to be reordained whom he had ordered. Sergius III. renewed all that Stephen had done against Formosus, and caused his *ordinations* to be declared *null over again.*"—*Courayer's Defence of the Ordinations in the Church of England*, p. 259. Courayer was a learned Roman Catholic. His work is highly esteemed by the divines of the Church of England.

A. D.	*Names of the Bishops and Archbishops.*	*Where and by whom ordained.*	*Years of Episcop.*	*Pages in Godwin.*
1020	Agelnoth.....	Rome.....	17	 55
1138	Theobald.....	London, Cardinal Albert, the pope's legate.....	22	 69
1174	Richard	Anagni, Pope Alexand. III.(*b*)	9	 78
1207	Stephen Langton....	Viterbo, Pope Innocent III.(*c*)	22	 86
1245	Boniface (*d*)..	Lyons, Pope Innocent IV. (*e*)	26	 92

Now Formosus ordained Plegmund, archbishop of Canterbury. He was never reordained. He ordained most of the bishops of England for twenty-six years. What became of the succession here?

(*b*) According to Onuphrius Panvinius, one of the Pope's most devoted biographers, the twenty-fourth schism in the popedom was between Alexander III. and Victor IV. Alexander held his chair by *sedition, war,* and *bloodshed*.—See *Platina in his Life*. Where was the true succession?

(*c*) Pope Innocent III. deposed our King John, and put the kingdom under an interdict for six years. Upon his restoring the kingdom to John, by his legate, Pandulph, he placed, *as a fine upon it, a yearly rent* of eight thousand marks, and ordered that the KINGDOM should be held of the pope as a FEE FARM! He made us a present of an archbishop of Canterbury.

(*d*) See Bishop Godwin's account of this covetous wretch; who says, that "he used all means, good or bad, to scrape money together, under the pretence of paying the debts of his predecessors; but that he consumed the whole in *war*." He threw the whole diocess into a flame by his violent and base proceedings.

(*e*) The reader will think, when he has read the following note, that Archbishop Boniface had received the *spirit* from the hand of his holiness, Pope Innocent IV., his ordainer,—not the Holy Spirit, but the *spirit of mammon*, the *demon of unrighteousness*. I take the account of Matthew Paris, as given by Archdeacon Mason, where much more to the same purpose is to be found. "The avarice of Rome had proceeded to such a length, and had ascended so high, that Robert, the bishop of Lincoln, caused a computation to be made by his clergy of the revenues which foreign priests and prelates drew out of England; and it was found, by true computation, that the present pope, viz., *Innocent IV.*, had impoverished the universal church more than all his predecessors: and that the annual revenues of *foreign clergymen*, whom the Romish Church enriched out of England, amounted to more than seventy thousand marks. The king's revenue alone did *not amount to a third part of that sum.*

"In the year 1253, Robert, bishop of Lincoln, wrote to this pope, in these words:—'Your wisdom will know that I obey the mandates of the apostolical see with filial affection and devoted reverence; and, with zeal for your paternal authority, I oppose and withstand all who oppose the mandates of the apostolical see. For the mandates of the apostolical see neither are nor can be any other than the doctrines of the apostles, and of our Lord Jesus Christ. The pope, in the hierarchy of the church, is the vicar of Christ. The holiness of the apostolical see cannot be opposed to him, (that is, to Christ.) The *tenor*, therefore, of *your letters is not agreeable to apostolical holiness*, but *altogether discordant thereto*. First, because of many such letters, spread every-

A. D.	*Names of the Bishops and Archbishops.*	*Where and by whom ordained.*	*Years of Episcop.*	*Pages in Godwin.*
1278	John Peckham.....	Pope Nicolas III. (*f*)	13	97
1294	Robert Winchelsey..	Rome, Cardinal Sabinus.....	19	100
1313	Walter Raynold.....	Robert Winchelsey.....	13	103
1327	Simon Mepham.....	Avignon, by order of Pope John XXII.....	5	105
1333	John Stratford.....	Avignon, Cardinal Vitalis.....	15	106
1349	Thos. Bradwardine..	Avignon, Cardinal Bertrand..	.....	111
1349	Simon Islip.....	R. Stratford, bishop of London, who was consecrated by John Stratford, archbp. of Canterbury, (*whom see*)..	16	112
1366	Simon Langham.....	Simon Islip, *as above*.....	.....	115
1414	Henry Chichley.....	Sienna, Pope Gregory XII.(*g*)	29	125

---

where,—*a flood* of inconstancy, *audacity*, impudent pretensions, and irreverence: of *lying, deceiving, &c., has broken in upon all.* Besides, *except the sin of Lucifer himself*, the son of perdition, none can be more detestable, abominable, and hateful to our Lord Jesus Christ, than *by such* BASE FRAUDS TO KILL AND DESTROY THE SOULS of our pastoral office and charge.' When *these things* came to the ears of the pope, unable to restrain his *wrath and indignation*, he, *with a terrible countenance*, and *a haughty mien*, exclaimed, 'Who is this *old, crazed, blind fool*, who *dares*, with such temerity, *judge our actions? By Peter and Paul*, were it not for our INBRED GENEROSITY, I would hurl such confusion upon him that his folly and punishment should astonish the world. WHAT! IS NOT THE KING OF ENGLAND OUR VASSAL? YEA, MORE, even OUR BOND SLAVE? And cannot we, *by a sovereign nod, imprison him, and bind him in his ignominy?*'" Pages of this sort of abominations, practiced by the popes in England, may be seen in Mason, lib. iv, cap. 14. He *goes through the reigns of thirteen kings*, with this evidence of the ROBBERIES *committed by the popes upon that kingdom.* I leave the reader to his own judgment upon *these apostolical successors.*

(*f*) Platina says, that Nicolas, to enrich his relations, ROBBED *others.* "He took away by violence the *castles* of certain *noble Romans*, and gave them to his own relatives." This *robber ordained Peckham, archbishop of Canterbury.* Bishop Godwin says, that "Peckham had hardly arrived in England, when the pope, his *creator*, (for so he was pleased to call him,) required a large sum of money from him, viz., four thousand marks. It will not be uninteresting to hear his answer. 'Behold,' says he, 'THOU *hast* CREATED *me*, and forasmuch as it is natural for a *creature* to desire to be perfected by his *creator*, so, in my distresses, I desire to be refreshed by your holiness. Truly a writ of *execution, horrible* to be seen, and *terrible* to be heard, has lately reached me, declaring, that except I answer to it within a month after the feast of St. Michael, by paying into the hands of the merchants of Lucca the sum of four thousand marks, *according to my bargain with the court of Rome*, I am then *to be excommunicated* and am to be *cursed* in my own and other principal churches, with BELL, BOOK, and CANDLES." Admirable successors—of Simon Magus!!

(*g*) The consecration of Chichley by the hands of Pope Gregory XII. is even put into Chichley's epitaph. Now this Gregory was one of the

ARCHBISHOPS OF YORK.

The *custom* was for the archbishops of Canterbury to consecrate the archbishops of York; but the popes, in the plenitude of their power, frequently overruled this regulation.*

A. D.	Names of the Bishops and Archbishops.	Where and by whom ordained.	Years of Episcop.	Pages in Godwin.
1119	Thurstan.....	Pope Calixtus.....	26	668
1147	Henry Mardac.....	Pope Eugenius	6	670
1154	Roger.....	Theobald, abp. of Canterbury, (*whom see*)..	27	673
1191	GeoffreyPlantagenet	Tours, by the pope's order.....	22	675
1215	Walter Grey.....	by Stephen Langton, (*whom see*)	40	677
1258	Godfrey de Kinton..	Rome	6	682
1279	William Wickwane..	Rome	6	682
1285	John Romanus.....	Rome	10	683
1299	Thomas Corbridge...	Rome, Pope Boniface VIII...	4	684
1305	Wm. de Greenfield...	Lyons, Pope Clement V.....	10	685
1307	William de Melton...	Avignon.....	23	685
1342	William le Zouch....	Avignon, Pope Clement VI...	10	686

BISHOPS OF DURHAM.

1133	Geoffrey Rufus.....	York, Thurstan of York, (*whom see*).....	12	734
1153	Hugo Pusar..	Rome.....	42	735
1197	Philip of Poictiers..	Rome, Pope Celestine III....	.....	738
1217	Richard de Marisco.	Walter Grey, archbishop of York, (*whom see*).....	9	739

---

then THREE PRETENDERS to the popedom; to end which schism the council of Constance was assembled. The history of these confusions has filled volumes. However, Gregory XII. was deposed, and John XXIII. or XXIV. kept the chair. Yet Chichley received his *episcopal succession from this Gregory*, declared by a *whole council* to be no pope of Rome, NO BISHOP AT ALL; and he, Chichley, continued to communicate these *false orders* to the *English bishops and archbishops*, even in the fifteenth century, *for twenty-nine years!* What an *unbroken line of valid ordinations!!*

These notes may suffice. They might be multiplied and enlarged greatly, but this is needless. The *fountains are corrupt:* the *streams cannot be pure.* Either the *popes* or the *archbishops of Canterbury* consecrated the *archbishops of York.* These two archbishops contaminated all the bishops of their distinct provinces. *Never was a sink of iniquity deeper than this!!*

* Vide Howell's Pontificate, p. 288, &c., and Bishop Godwin, pp. 668, &c.

A. D.	Names of the Bishops and Archbishops.	Where and by whom ordained.	Years of Episcop.	Page in Godwin.
1249	Walter de Kirkham.	Same as the above	10	742
1283	Anthony Beak	Wickwane, archbp. of York, (*whom see*)	28	743
1311	Richard Kellow	Greenfield, archbp. of York, (*whom see*)	5	745
1318	Lewis Beaumont	Rome	14	745
1345	Thomas Hatfield	Rome	36	749

BISHOPS OF WINCHESTER.

909	Frithstan	Plegmund, abp, of Canterbury, (*whom see*)	23	
1070	Walkelin	Pope's legate	27	213
1174	Richard Toclivius	Richard, abp. of Canterbury, (*whom see*)	15	216
1205	Petrus de Rupibus	Rome	34	217
1260	Ethelmar	Rome, Pope Alexander IV.	1	220
1262	John of Oxford	Rome	3	221
1282	John de Pontissara	Rome	24	222
1323	John de Stratford	Avignon	10	224

Winchester and Durham are taken as specimens out of the provincial sees: it is needless to go further. Proof abundant is here given that the *episcopal ordinations* in the *Church of England* flowed steadily through all the filth of *Popery*.

We have shown the sin of *simony* in the popedom in the last section. The old adage is, "*The receiver is as bad as the thief.*" The English bishops *regularly traded with* ROME *in simonical traffic:* evidence enough of this is found in Bishop Gadwin's Lives of the English Prelates. The court of Rome *sold every thing.* "Sometimes," says Godwin, "those who had purchased, were, by a fraudulent clause in a subsequent bull, thrown out of their purchase." It was then sold to a second huckster, and the pope received double. P. 106. John of Oxford, bishop of Winchester, paid six thousand marks to the pope for his consecration, and the same sum to Jordan, the pope's chancellor. P. 222. Greenfield, archbishop of York, was two years before he could obtain his confirmation and consecration from the pope, and then he paid nine thousand five hundred marks for the favour. P. 685. When Moreton became archbishop of Canterbury, Bishop Godwin says "he spunged from the bishops of the provinces a large

amount of money, compelling them, by the authority of the pope, to bear the cost of his translation to that see—to the amount of fifteen thousand pounds. P. 131.

"These, and other enormities, viz., all manner of avarice, usury, simony, and rapine: all kinds of luxury, libidinousness, gluttony, and pride, reign in the court of Rome,—

Ejus avaritiæ totus non sufficit orbis
Ejus luxuriæ meretrix non sufficit omnis." *

The incapacity of these lord bishops was often ludicrous. When Beaumont was made bishop of Durham, Godwin says, "he was lame of both feet, and so *illiterate* that he could not *read* the documents of his consecration. The word *metropoliticæ* occurring, he hesitated, and being unable to pronounce it, he exclaimed, '*Let us skip it and go on.*'" So also when he came to the term *œnigmate*, "*sticking in the mud again*," says Godwin, "he burst out into these words,—'*By Saint Lewis! he was very uncourteous who wrote that word there.*'" His next successor but one in the same see was Thomas Hatfield. When the pope was reasoned with, that Hatfield was a young, trifling fellow, without either knowledge, gravity, or sincerity, he answered,—"If the king of England [who had requested the pope to consecrate this Hatfield] had asked me now *to make an* ASS *a bishop, I would not have refused him.*" P. 750.

That *all bishops were pledged to Popery* before the Reformation will be evident from the account of the *pall*, and the *bishop's* OATH *of fidelity to the pope*. Fox, the venerable martyrologist, shall state this matter: "This pope, [Alexander III.,] among many other his acts, had certain councils, some in *France*, some at *Rome* in *Lateran*, by whom it was decreed, that no archbishop should receive the pall, unless he should *first* SWEAR. Concerning the solemnity of which pall, for the order and manner of giving and taking the same, *with obedience to the pope*, as it is contained in their own words, I thought it good to set forth unto thee, that thou mayest well consider and understand their doings.

"The form and manner, how and by what words the

* Archdeacon Mason's Vindic. Eccles. Anglican., p. 522.

pope is wont to give the pall unto the archbishop, in English :—

"To the honour of Almighty God, and of blessed Mary, the virgin, and of blessed Peter and Paul, and of *our* LORD POPE N. and of *the holy Church of Rome*, and also of the church N., committed to your charge, we give to you the pall, taken from the body of St. Peter, *as a fulness of the office pontifical*, which you may wear within your own church upon certain days, which be expressed in the privileges of the said church, granted by the see apostolic.

"In like manner proceedeth the *oath* of every bishop, *swearing obedience to the pope*, in like words as followeth, in English :—

"I, N., bishop of N., from this hour henceforth, will be *faithful* and *obedient* to blessed St. Peter, and to the holy apostolic Church of Rome, *and to my lord N. the pope*. I shall be in no council, nor help either with my consent or deed, whereby either of them, or any member of them may be impaired, or whereby they may be taken with any evil taking. The council which they shall commit to me either by themselves, or by messengers, or by their letters, wittingly or willingly, I shall utter to none to their hindrance. To the *retaining and maintaining the Papacy of Rome*, and the regalities of St. Peter, I shall be aider (so mine order be saved) against all persons, &c. *So God help me and these holy gospels of God.*" *

The learned Mr. Johnson, who was proctor for the clergy of the diocess of Canterbury, says, that "both the archbishop of Canterbury, and he of York, from the time of Austin and Paulinus, down to the reign of Henry VIII., (saving that eight of this province [*York*] had it not, viz., those between Paulinus and Egbert,) received *a pall* from Rome, for which they *paid* an unreasonable sum. This pall was a supernumeral robe of *lambs' wool*, curiously adorned, and worn by the archbishop when he celebrated: it is *still* the *arms* or *device* of the archbishopric of Canterbury. It was pretended to be an ensign of archiepiscopal authority, but was in *reality a badge of slavery to the see of Rome.*" † And will the metropolitan of all England

* Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. i, p. 259, fol. edition. Lon., 1684.
† Johnson's Clergyman's Vade Mecum, vol. i, p. 41, fourth edition, 1715.

continue to bear, in the *most distinguished place and manner*,—"in REALITY A BADGE of SLAVERY to the SEE of ROME?" Let the Church of England put such things away. They are discreditable and injurious to the cause of Protestantism in general.

Here, then, is sufficient evidence of the point that the episcopal ordinations in the Church of England, before the Reformation, came through the "*series of monsters*,"—the popes of Rome. Evidence also has been given that the bishops, generally, were as corrupt as the popes. "*All ecclesiastical degrees*, even from the pope to the doorkeepers, were oppressed with damnable simony." St. Bernard says that ambitious, covetous, sacrilegious, simoniacal, incestuous persons, fornicators, and such like *monsters* of mankind, flowed from all parts of the world to Rome, that by the apostolical authority they either might obtain or keep ecclesiastical honours." Such were the ordainers and the ordained! Blessed channels! through whom *alone* the power and authority to preach a *holy* gospel is to be communicated for the salvation of the world!

SECTION XIII.

NULLITY OF POPISH ORDINATIONS OF ENGLISH BISHOPS CONCLUDED.

HAVING in the preceding sections exhibited a brief view of the ordainers of the English bishops before the Reformation, and of the persons who were ordained by them, our way is now clear for the more immediate discussion of these Popish ordinations. Three questions require our consideration here: first, what is ordination? secondly, what are the Scriptural regulations on the subject, as to the ordainers and the persons to be ordained? and thirdly, what, according to these rules, is the validity of these Popish ordinations?

First, what is ordination? Ordination is that act of the church by which persons are solemnly set apart to the ministry of the gospel. It is usually performed by *laying on the hands* of the ministers already existing in that church.

Apostolical usage countenances this form; but no particular form was ever made *necessary*. The priests under the law had no imposition of hands in their ordination: the apostles had no imposition of hands in their ordination: it is *never commanded*. It is decent and proper, but not *essential:* not necessary to ordination. Some persons will *assert* the contrary, and maintain that *imposition of hands is essential* to ordination. The reader, who will receive assertions for proof, will believe them: sufficient Scriptural proofs they have not; and human authority can enjoin nothing as *essential* in divine matters, such as the ministry of the gospel. To make this more clear, we may remark, that all the great writers on the subject generally grant that there is no command in the word of God enjoining either any particular matter or form of ordination: that is, in plainer language, no particular action, sign, or form of words, is enjoined as necessary to ordination: imposition of hands, consequently, is not enjoined, and therefore is not necessary. If we come to *custom*, it may be observed, that the Jewish sanhedrim, from which it is supposed that the Christian church took many of its ordination ceremonies, that this sanhedrim admitted, for a long period, ordinations to be performed without imposition of hands. Is was frequently done by a written document, to absent persons, *simply declaring them ordained;* in the same manner as one of the ministers of the sovereign would appoint a lieutenant to a county.* As to the opinions of Christian writers on the subject, they did not, for above a thousand years after the apostles' time, define what they considered necessary to ordination. When they began to attempt this, some fixed upon one thing, and some upon another, in endless confusion. Those who at last came to place *imposition of hands* among the *essentials*, did it upon no other ground than this, that the church had willed it to be so by its usage. They grant that the church might have used it or not used it, without violating any divine authority. The argument, then, is based on false premises, as it assumes that the church can *add* to the *essentials* of religion. The conclusion, of course, falls to the ground. And the position remains immovable, that, as there is no command in the word of God enjoining any particular

* See Selden, de Syn., b. ii, c. 7, sec. 1.

action, sign, or form of words, as necessary to ordination, therefore, no particular action, sign, or form of words, is necessary to ordination: consequently, imposition of hands is not necessary to ordination. We may simply remark, in conclusion, that the words used by the Church of Rome and the Church of England,—"Receive thou the Holy Ghost, &c.," were not used by the Christian church for *above a thousand years* after Christ.*

Secondly, what are the Scriptural regulations on the subject of ordinations, as to the ordainers, and the persons to be ordained. From the nature of the case, the qualifications are generally the same as to both parties. The reader is requested *carefully to bear in mind that part of section fourth, extending from page* 75 *to page* 84. From this he will see that *holiness of life*, the *call of God*, and *soundness in the faith*, are required in a minister by our Lord and his apostles. The special command given by St. Paul to Timothy, as to the *ordainers*, is as follows: "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to *faithful men*, who shall be able to teach others," 2 Tim. ii, 2. This cannot reasonably be interpreted to mean less than these two things: first, that the man is a true believer, a true Christian; and secondly, that he must give suitable evidence that he will be *faithful* to the *truth* and *trust* of the gospel, as a steward of its mysteries: less than this would not answer the divine requisition. Calvin remarks, with his accustomed good sense, that the apostle requires them to be "*faithful men*, not according to that faith which is *common* to Christians in general, but that by way of emphasis they should *specially excel* in faith." This is corroborated by the qualification for deacons: even they were to be "*men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom*," Acts vi, 3.

Then, as to the persons to be ordained: the reader should *keep in mind what has been said in section fourth, as above referred to:* especially what is laid down by divine authority on the subject in 1 Tim. iii, 1–7, and Titus i, 5–9:

* See on the points above stated, Morinus de Ordinationibus: Calassutii Not. Eccles., p. 178: Altare Damascenum, p. 174, edit. 1708: Stillingfleet's Irenicum, pp. 270 and 392: Masoni de Ministerio Anglicano, pp. 216, &c.; and Courayer on English Ordinations, chap. x, pp. 161 and 197, edit. Lond., 1725.

"This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach, not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous: one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?) not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil." "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee; if any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly. For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God: not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; but a lover of hospitality: a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate: holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." Here, *personal piety*, an *unblamable life*, *knowledge of the gospel*, *ability to teach*, &c., are strictly required. One point deserves especial notice here, as great mistakes arise from overlooking it, viz., *the call of God*, as PRECEDING all human appointment to the office of the ministry. This call is stated and proved at page 77. Archbishop Potter, a high authority on the subject, maintains "that the whole power of erecting the Christian church, and of governing it since it was erected, is derived from [God] the Father. But then the person by whom this power is immediately conferred is *the Holy Spirit*. And the authority and *special grace*, whereby the apostles and *all church officers* execute their respective functions, are in the same manner ascribed to the Spirit. So that *all* ecclesiastical authority, and the graces whereby men are enabled to exercise this authority to the benefit of the church, are the *gifts* of the *Holy Spirit*."* So Bishop Wilson:

*Archbishop Potter on Church Government, pp. 254–256, edit. Bagster. Lond., 1838.

"As we consult God, as Jesus Christ himself did, when we ordain men to his service, so should we consult Jesus Christ when we assign them a place in his family. *Would Jesus Christ have given this man the charge of the souls* of this parish? That we may have the comfort of knowing that we enter into the ministry by a choice which *proceeded from God*, we must have some assurance in our own hearts, that the glory of God, the good of souls, was in our intention and that we were called regularly, and according to the intention of the church. It belongs to THEE, O HOLY SPIRIT of grace, to *send* such guides into thy church as may lead thy people in the right way, and to be the guide of those guides."* And Peter Damian, cardinal, bishop of Ostia, who assisted the popes in the eleventh century to settle the question of disputed ordinations, grants fully, that "*all* that is great and holy in ordination is by the receiving of the *Holy Spirit;* so that their ordination is to be *ascribed to God* and not to man; and that the priests, on their ordination, do, as it were, become *clothed with the righteousness of God*."† From these statements, and from what has been above referred to, it clearly follows, that, as the call of God must *precede* the human appointment, and be the *basis* upon which it rests, any human appointment which supersedes, contradicts, or *sets aside*, this divine call, is *null and void* to all intents and purposes. *God's call can never contradict his own requisitions.* He who requires in his written word, as qualifications for this office, that the candidates for it should be "*just and holy*," would never, by the Holy Ghost, call *a wicked and unholy* man: he who requires, by his written word, a man to be "*blameless*," would never call a man by the Holy Ghost who had nothing but what was *full of blame:* he who requires by his written word that a man be "*sober and temperate*," would never call a man by the holy Ghost who was *a drunkard:* he who by his written word requires a man not to be given to "*filthy lucre*," would never by the Holy Ghost call a *simonist, a trader in holy things:* he who by his written word requires a man "*to hold fast the faithful word*," would never by the Holy Ghost call *a heretic* to this ministry. No *wicked men*, therefore, no *drunkards*, no *simonists*,

* Bishop Wilson's Meditations in the Oxford Tracts, No. 65.
† Damiani de Eccles. Inst., cap. 3, edit. 1536, 12mo.

no *heretics*, as such, ever had *the call of God*. But the greatest part of the ordainers and the ordained before the Reformation were wicked, drunkards, simonists, heretics, &c. : see section xi and xii. God never sent them. "The blind led the blind, and both fell into the ditch." For any *human* authority knowingly to put such men into the ministry is to break God's ordinances, to introduce wolves instead of shepherds into the fold of Christ, and to increase the condemnation of the men so obtruded upon the church. He who ordains a wicked man to the ministry is a traitor to God and the church. Such is the view we derive from this *supreme authority*. If men speak according to these oracles, let us hear them; but, if otherwise, they are of no authority. Let God be true, though every man be a liar.

Our English reformers have some fine remarks on this subject. In the declaration made of the functions and divine institution of bishops and priests by the convocation, as noticed above, they say, "This *office*, &c., is subject, determined, and restrained unto those *certain limits* and *ends* for the which the same was appointed by GOD'S ORDINANCE: which, as was said before, is only to administer and distribute unto the members of Christ's mystical body, *spiritual* and everlasting things: that is to say, the pure and heavenly doctrine of Christ's gospel, and the graces conferred in his sacraments. And therefore this said power and administration is called, in some places of Scripture, *donum et gracia*, a gift and grace; in some places it is called *claves sive potestas clavium*, that is to say, the keys, or the power of the keys: whereby is signified a certain limited office, restrained unto the execution of *a special* function or ministration, according to the saying of St. Paul in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, and in the fourth chapter of his First Epistle to Timothy, and also in the fourth chapter of his Epistle to the Ephesians." After a lengthened comment on the last reference, they conclude thus: "By which words it appeareth evidently, not only that St. Paul accounted and numbered this said power and office of the pastors and doctors among the *proper* and *special gifts* of the *Holy Ghost*, but it also appeareth that the same was a LIMITED *power* and *office, ordained* especially and ONLY for the causes and purposes before rehearsed." *These are golden sentences.*

The office, power, and and authority of bishops and presbyters "is subject, determined, and restrained unto those certain *limits* and *ends* for the which the same was appointed by *God's ordinance*." From these premises it follows,—

First, that it is limited to *spiritual* matters: ministers of the gospel have no authority over the body and substance of the people, either directly or indirectly:

Secondly, that it is limited to the *edification* of the church, to the building up of God's people in their most holy faith: as soon, then, as ever any one begins to *subvert* the *faith* of the church, his office loses its authority:

Thirdly, that all bishops and presbyters are limited in their ordinations, not only to such qualifications of the candidates as "*God's ordinance*" requires, but also they are limited by God's ordinance in the power and authority they give to those whom they ordain: that is, they cannot give either *more* or *less* than is "*determined by God's ordinance.*"

From overlooking this last point, a silly argument has been attempted by many writers on episcopacy, in order to prove that though presbyters in the apostles' time might have the power of ordination, yet if, when modern bishops ordained any presbyters, they did not choose to give these presbyters *authority to ordain*, that then these presbyters have no divine authority to ordain. This is saying *not* that "God's ordinance," but that the BISHOPS' DICTUM determines the limits of the gospel ministry. A delightful doctrine to high Churchmen! but a doctrine which is the very *essence of Popery itself*. That any particular church may make prudential arrangements on the subject of ordination as a rule for its own ministers, is readily granted; but this is a *mere human affair*, and never can in the least affect in the sight of God the authority of any true minister of Christ in the church of God. Presbyters in the apostles' time were the same as bishops: Timothy was ordained by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Presbyters, then, had divine authority to ordain in the apostles' times—God never took it away—no power on earth can take it away. Presbyters, therefore, always had, and always will have, a divine right to ordain. Such are the divine limitations of the ministry—to *spiritual* things only; to *edification* and not to subversion of the faith; to

the *qualifications* of the persons, and to the restraining and fixing of the ministerial power and authority. Let these rules be observed, and a universal reformation must be the consequence; but if the traditions of men are preferred to the commandments of God, men so sent will preach in vain: *God never sent them.* He will not forsake his faithful people; but such men shall not profit them. This is substantially the meaning of the twenty-sixth article in the Church of England. It gives too much authority to such men; but its principal design is to show that the effect of Christ's ordinance is *not taken away* by their wickedness—"from *such* as by *faith* and rightly do receive the sacraments:" that is, that the *true Shepherd will not forsake his flock* because wolves happen to be over them. Very true; but this will not prove that a wolf is either a sheep or a shepherd. Wo to the men who on such a principle place wolves over the flock of Christ!

The desire to maintain an external unity led to an early corruption in this matter. For the supposed honour of the church, and to prevent divisions, as the fathers state, ordination was very generally given up into the hands of the bishops. Many of them became tyrannical, proud, wicked, and worldly. And what made the case worse still, was this, that during the fourth century the greatest part of them *became* ARIANS, denying the true Godhead of Christ, and the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost. Now what was to be done, when those who maintained the orthodox faith began again to prevail? They must either deny that *heretics*, as the Arians were, could give *true orders*, and consequently altogether reject the *Arian bishops*, and *their ordinations;* or they must receive their orders as valid and Christian. Well, to *patch* up the matter, and save the *honour* of the bishops, they generally received the *ordinations* of the *Arians*. And it is probable that nearly all the episcopal ordinations in the world have come from Arians. A glorious succession! Then followed the attempt to *find reasons*, and make *decrees*, to *justify* such UNSCRIPTURAL and ABSURD proceedings. For what can be more unscriptural and absurd than to pretend that a man, who refuses to receive Jesus Christ, by *refusing to* "*honour the Son even as he honours the Father*" John v, 23—that such a man, I say, can have *a commission from*

Christ, to ORDAIN *others* TO DENY HIM *also?* To pretend to salve this by saying, that if he uses the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and does this by the *authority* of the *church*, his acts are valid, is a sophism. The authority of the church is *limited* by the Scriptures—by the *authority of God:* the church, therefore, can give no authority contrary to the Scriptures; but the Scriptures "*reject all heretics*" —all that "deny the Lord that bought them," 2 Pet. ii, 1;—therefore the church can give such heretics no authority: see section fourth. The words, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are either used *according to Scripture truth*, or they are *not*. If an Arian should use them, according to Scripture (an impossible supposition) he *comes to God* with A LIE in his mouth: that is, he pronounces *as true* what HE BELIEVES TO BE FALSE, and this he does with the intention of deceiving both God and man. To suppose Christ would set his seal to this lie, would be blasphemy. An Arian, therefore, cannot use them in a true sense. Suppose, then, that he uses them in a *perverted sense*,—did Christ *ever give him a commission to pervert his truth, and to appoint others to pervert it?* This again is blasphemous and absurd. An Arian, therefore, *has no commission:* HE CAN GIVE NONE. All he does is *null and void* to all intents and purposes. A righteous division is better than a sinful unity. The orthodox should have acted on this principle. However, too much wickedness in life had at that time spread over those parts which held the orthodox view of the Trinity, so that there was not moral courage enough to resist and counteract these abominations. Heresy is destructive; *and faith, without works, is dead.* Nothing but a living, fruitful faith, can conquer the world.

SIMONY is a point to be well considered here. Though this was an early evil, yet as it never could be embraced by any part of the church, as a *mark* of a *sect* or division in the church, so no evil schemes to defend it were laboured out by perverted ingenuity. It has always been condemned by decisions of councils, as the *foulest of sins;* as the following extracts will show:—

"If any bishop, priest, or deacon, obtain his *dignity* by MONEY, let him, and him who ordained him, *be deposed*, and wholly CUT OFF FROM communion, as Simon Magus was by Peter."—Apostolical Canons, No. 22. I am aware

of the dispute about the authority of these canons. I believe them to be of no apostolical authority. However, it is generally acknowledged that they give us the views and practice of the church, in fact, at a very early age. They were, in the fourth and following centuries, referred to as ecclesiastical authority. They are in great estimation with high Churchmen. Mr. Johnson, the learned translator of the canons, a strong succession advocate, remarks in his notes on this canon:—"Indeed, in the case of *simony*, it may be said, that he who obtained *orders* by this means, *his orders were null ab initio*,"—*from the beginning*. He never had any really.

"If any bishop *ordain for money*, and make *a market* of the unvendible grace, and perform the ordination of a bishop, village-bishop, priest, deacon, or of any one listed in the clergy, for *gain*, &c., let him that is ordained be never the better for his ordination."—*Council of Chalcedon*, A. D. 451, can. 2. There were present six hundred bishops.

"That they who are *ordained for* MONEY, be *deposed*, and the *bishop who ordained* them."—*Council* of Constantinople, or Trullus, A. D. 683, canon 22.

"Whosoever either SELL or BUY *holy orders* cannot be *priests:* hence it is written, '*Cursed* be he that gives and he that receives.' How, therefore, if they be accursed, and are not holy, can they consecrate others? *How can he bless*, who is *accursed* himself? There is no *power in ordination*, where *buying* and *selling* prevail."—Canon Law, by Gratian, in the twelfth century.

"If any one should be enthroned in Peter's chair by MONEY, by human favour, by popular or military tumult, without the united and canonical election of the cardinals, such a one is NOT *apostolical*, but is an APOSTATE; and the cardinals, clergy, and people of God, may anathematize him as A THIEF and A ROBBER, and may, by all human means, drive him from the *apostolical seat*."—Second Council of Lateran, Vid. Platin. in Vita. Nicolai. tertii.

"Whatever *holy orders* are obtained by MONEY, either given or promised to be given, we declare that they were NULL from the *beginning*, and NEVER had any *validity*."—Council of Placentina, A. D. 1095, can. 2.

In the fortieth canon of the Church of England, simony, the buying and selling of orders, &c., is declared to be

"a detestable sin, and *execrable* before God." And every bishop, priest, &c., before he is admitted to any spiritual office, is obliged to take the following oath:—"I, N. N., do swear that I have made no simoniacal payment, contract, or promise, directly or indirectly, by myself or by any other, to my knowledge or with my consent, to any person or persons whatsoever, for or concerning the procuring and obtaining of this ecclesiastical office, &c. So help me God, through Jesus Christ."

Here, then, we have seen what *qualifies* a person for ordination; and what *disqualifies* him. Heaven has laid down the LAW. The authority of the church is *limited* by the authority of GOD. Every person *truly* ordained, must be ordained according to the *word of God*; and must be ordained specially and only for the causes and purposes therein contained. Every ordination which is plainly and knowingly contrary to this rule, is *null and void* from beginning to end. But the ordination of every man who is plainly not a "faithful man:" that is, a true Christian, the ordination of every wicked man, of every HERETIC, and of every SIMONIST, is flatly contrary to the word of God; therefore the ordination of every wicked man, of every heretic, of every simonist, is null and void from the beginning, it is NO ORDINATION AT ALL.

Let us apply this *divine rule* to the *Popish ordinations* of *English bishops*, before and at the Reformation. The Church of Rome, by the united judgment of the reformers, was the "great whore" mentioned in the Revelation. Can this "great whore" have *legitimate children?* Common sense, as well as the Scriptures, would declare—No! The Church of Rome is an *idolatrous* church: can she, as such, have a *heavenly commissioned priesthood!*—Impossible! The popes, *bishops of Rome*, who ordained the English bishops, were MONSTERS in crime, *heretics* and *simonists* of the darkest dye. They could have no commission from a holy God: they were "sons of Belial," "antichrist:" they, therefore, *could give no commission.*

The English bishops, generally, before the Reformation, were true sons of the "great whore." They *bought and sold*, and *trafficked in spiritual things:* they were wicked men, *idolaters* and *simonists.* Any ordination of such men would be null from the beginning: would be nothing:—

more, if possible, when they were ordained by those monsters of iniquity, the popes of Rome. The CONCLUSION, then, is irresistible—POPISH ORDINATIONS *of the* ENGLISH BISHOPS BEFORE *and* AT *the* REFORMATION *were* NULL *and* VOID *to* ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES!!*

* Two objections are sometimes urged against this conclusion: first,—that though one bishop who ordains might be vicious, a simonist, a heretic, &c., yet the others concerned in the ordination might not be so; and, secondly, it is urged that Judas continued to possess full apostolical authority notwithstanding his being a thief, a devil, and a traitor; and that, therefore, a bishop retains full episcopal authority, however wicked he may be. Let us examine these objections.

Objection 1st.—That though one bishop who ordains might be vicious, a simonist, a heretic, &c., yet the others concerned in the ordination might not be so. This, I believe, is as the matter is usually stated. But the true state of the question is different. We will state it on their own principles: viz., on ecclesiastical authority—Scriptural authority it has none. In the ordination of a bishop there is always *one* bishop who *alone* consecrates: this is the universal language of the rituals on the subject: the other bishops who take part in the ceremony are rather there as witnesses than as consecrators. The ancient rituals never speak of more than *one* consecrator. In all the ancient Greek forms of ordination, as exhibited by Morinus, *one* bishop *only lays his hand* on the head of the person to be ordained, the other bishops *touching the Gospels* placed upon the head of the person to be ordained. In the Roman Church the other bishops touched his head, but did not lay their hands on his head. *One* bishop *only* pronounced the consecration prayer. This was, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, either the pope or the archbishop: see Morinus, part ii. pages 234 and 250. The consecration of bishops, therefore, always depended upon the capability of the *one* bishop who consecrated; and whenever he was found to be really incompetent, the general rule was to *quash all his ordinations*. The monsters of iniquity, the popes, as exhibited in the preceding pages, were the *sole* consecrators of the English bishops, as stated in section xii. By Scriptural rule they were utterly incompetent: their ordinations were consequently NULL. The rule just stated makes it difficult to prove the validity of Archbishop Parker's consecration: upon which all the present ordinations and consecrations of the English Church *since* the Reformation depend. Barlow was his *only* consecrator; but there is not full proof that Barlow himself was consecrated. The acts of the consecration of bishops are generally registered in the archives of the archbishop, but no registration of Barlow's consecration can be found.

Objection 2d.—It is urged that Judas continued to possess full apostolical authority, notwithstanding his being a thief, a devil, and a traitor; and that therefore a bishop retains full episcopal authority, however wicked he may be. We answer,—

First, there is no proof that Judas was a wicked man when *first* put into his office.

Secondly, it is acknowledged by Churchmen of considerable note,

This was the general opinion of the Protestant churches at the Reformation; and even before that time the same opinion was maintained by the Waldenses. In the Treatise of Antichrist, by the old Waldenses, written A. D. 1200, having described antichrist, they go on—"that iniquity that is after this manner, with *all the ministers thereof*, great and small, with all those that follow

(v. Archbishop Potter on Church Government, pp. 35, 38, 51 and 52, ed. *Bagster*, 1838,) that the office of the apostles, *before* our Lord's resurrection, was *a very limited one.* They performed *no ordinations*, exercised *no superintendence over any societies*, had no *authority whatever over a single human being.* When their commission was more fully given, they were to wait in Jerusalem until they received power from on high. This was given on the day of Pentecost.

Thirdly, limited as this commission was in Judas's time, there is no proof that he performed a single act, *as an apostle*, or had any countenance from our Lord to do so, *after* he had become a thief, a devil, and a traitor. It was *only six days* before that passover at which our Lord suffered, that Judas is *first* charged with any of these crimes. It was certainly *after* even this time that the devil is said to have entered into Judas: his treason followed this. There is no proof, therefore, that he was continued in the authority of an apostle for a single day *after* any of these crimes.

Fourthly, it is said *expressly* that "*Judas* BY TRANSGRESSION FELL *from his apostleship*," Acts i, 25. "And none of them IS *lost* but the son of perdition," John xvii, 12. Judas is here spoken of as already "*lost*," and as being the "*son of perdition.*" He was lost from Jesus, and consequently lost from his apostleship, *before* he hanged himself.

The conclusion is, that there is no proof that Judas was continued a single day in his apostleship, or that he was allowed to perform a single act, *as an apostle*, *after* his transgression: but, on the contrary, it is *positively asserted* in the word of God, that "by transgression he fell from it." No bishop, then, has an iota of authority from this case *after* he becomes a wicked man: but it distinctly and positively proves that, *as a wicked man*, "*by transgression he falls from his office.*" *So fall for ever all such schemes, in which bigoted, infatuated men, would hide their intolerance and abominations!*

Some readers may wonder why I have taken the pains to expose this last monstrous effort to make Judas, as the Rev. Charles Radcliffe humourously said, "a *hook* on which to *hang* the apostolical succession." I can tell them. In my simplicity, I supposed such a thing too monstrous to be attempted; but I find I have been mistaken. Even evangelical clergymen, I have been told on good authority, have had the hardihood and infatuation to use it in the pulpit. But what crowns all, is, that the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, B. C. L., chaplain in ordinary to the queen, in an answer which he has written to this Essay, by the request of Dr. Hook, &c., and dedicated, by permission, to the archbishop of Canterbury, has placed this case of Judas among his arguments!! See p. 85 of his "Apology for the Apostolical Succession."

them with a wicked heart, and hoodwinked eyes: this congregation, thus taken all together, is called *antichrist*, or Babylon, or the fourth beast, or the whore, or the man of sin, or the son of perdition. His MINISTERS are called *false prophets*, lying teachers, the ministers of darkness, &c. Antichrist covers his iniquity by the length or *succession* of time,—by the spiritual *authority* of the *apostles*, —by the writings of the ancients, and by councils. These and many other things are, as it were, a cloak and a garment, wherewith antichrist doth cover his lying wickedness, that he may not be rejected as a pagan, (or infidel,) and under which he can go on to act his villanies like a whore. Now it is evident, as well in the Old as in the New Testament, that a Christian stands bound, by *express command* given, to SEPARATE HIMSELF from *antichrist*." Then a great many passages of Scripture are quoted to prove this duty of separating from antichrist. On this ground it was also that they *rebaptized* those who had been baptized by the *Popish* bishops and priests, accounting them sacrilegious and antichristian ministers, and INCAPABLE of *administering any sacraments*. See Schlosser's note to his Latin version of Wall on Infant Baptism.*

Calvin was consulted to know what should be done when any bishop, curate, &c., from among the *Papists*, should desire to join himself to the *reformed church?* He remarks, "first, that if he should be found not to have sufficient ability and qualification for the office of a minister, he should show the sincerity of his conversion by retiring into the station of *a private member* of the church. But if he should be found able to continue in the ministry, he was to *give in a confession of his faith*, and of his sincere and sacred adherence to the reformed religion. Then he was to acknowledge that his VOCATION or call to the ministry had been A MERE ABUSE: he was to request *a new approbation:* he was *expressly* and by name to *profess* that his FORMER INSTITUTION by the *authority of the pope had been of no validity;* and at the same time he was to *renounce it* as being conferred by *means* EVERY WAY UNLAWFUL and *opposed* to the ORDER which the Lord Jesus Christ established in the church. After this, he was to join himself to the company of the other reformed ministers,

* Vol. ii, p. 166, 4to. Hamburgi, 1753.

and be subject to the discipline and government established in that place where they are. It is certain and clear that men can be accounted *Christian ministers*, except they first RENOUNCE the PRIESTHOOD of POPERY, to which they had been promoted to make and offer Christ as a sacrifice in the mass: which is a kind of blasphemy to be detested by all possible means. These things being done, it will be the duty of such bishops to give diligence that all the churches that pertain to their diocess be purged from errors, idolatry, &c."*

Here this great reformer, whose views were generally received almost like laws in a large portion of the reformed church, throws *Popish ordinations to the winds*. How abundantly this letter proves the misrepresentations of such men as Dr. Hook, who would fain persuade us that where episcopacy was not retained, "the reformers pleaded *not principle*, BUT NECESSITY." Even Bishop Taylor grants the contrary. "M. Du Plessis," says he, "a man of honour and great learning, does attest, that at the first Reformation there were *many archbishops* and cardinals in Germany, England, France, and Italy, that joined in the Reformation, whom they," the reformed churches, "*might but did not*, employ in their *ordinations*. And what necessity can be pretended in this case, I would fain learn, that I might make their defence. But, which is of more and deeper consideration, for this might have been done by inconsideration and irresolution, as often happens in the beginning of great changes; but it is their *constant* and *resolved practice*, at least in France, that if *any returns* to them, they will REORDAIN *him* by their PRESBYTERY, *though he had before* EPISCOPAL ORDINATION, as both their friends and their enemies bear witness."† Here then is evidence from that illustrious champion of Protestantism, Du Plessis, and from the French church in general, that it was the constant and resolved practice to reject *Popish ordinations* as NULL and VOID.

The English reformers viewed the matter in the same light. They continued to ordain as *Christian ministers*, but *not* on the *ground* of their PAPAL ORDINATIONS: else why

* Calvini Epistol., p. 339, fol. edit. Genev., 1575.

† He refers to Daneus, Isagog., part ii, lib. 2, c. 22, Perron Repli., fol. 92, impress. 1605.

so solemn a discussion by the bishops and divines in that day, on such questions as this?—

"*Question* 13. Whether (if it fortuned a Christian prince learned, to conquer certain dominions of infidels, having none but temporal learned men with him,) if it be defended by God's law, that he and they should preach and teach the word of God there, or no? And also MAKE and CONSTITUTE priests, or no?

"*Agreement.* In the thirteenth: concerning the first part, *whether laymen may preach and teach God's word?* They DO ALL AGREE, *in such a case*, 'that not *only they may*, but *they ought* to teach.' But in the *second part*, touching the *constituting of priests* of [by] LAYMEN, my lord of York, and Doctor Edgworth, doth *not* agree with the other: they say that laymen in no wise can make priests, or have such authority: the bishops of Duresme, St. David's, Westminster, Drs. Tresham, Cox, Leighton, Crawford, Symmons, Redmayn, and Robertson, say that *laymen, in such case*, have authority to minister the sacraments, and to MAKE PRIESTS. My lords of London, Carlisle, and Hereford, and Dr. Coxen, think that God, *in such a case*, would give the prince authority, call him inwardly, and illuminate him or some of his, as he did St. Paul." *

So the great Protestant champions against Popery, Whitaker and Fulke, in the time of Queen Elizabeth: speaking to the Papists, "I would not have you think," says Whitaker, "that we make such reckoning of *your orders*, as to hold our own vocation *unlawful* without them." "And," says Fulke, "you are *highly deceived* if you think we *esteem* your offices of bishops, priests, and deacons, *better than* LAYMEN." (And in his Retentive:) "*With all our hearts we defy, abhor, detest,—your antichristian orders.*" †

Bishop Burnet, in his Exposition of the Twenty-third Article, says, "I come, in the next place, to consider the second part of this article, which is the definition here given of those that are *lawfully called* and *sent:* this is put in very general words, far from that magisterial stiffness in which some have taken upon them to dictate in

* Burnet's Coll. of Records, part i, book iii, No. 21.

† See Ward's England's Reformation, vol. ii, p. 121, where he refers to Whitaker Contra Dureum, p. 221, and Fulke's Answer to a Counterfeit Catholic.

this matter. The article does not resolve this into any particular constitution, but *leaves the matter open and at large*, for such ACCIDENTS as *had happened*, and such as *might* still happen. They who drew it had the state of several churches before their eyes that had been differently reformed, and although their own had been less forced to go out of the beaten path than any other, yet they *knew* that ALL THINGS *among themselves* had NOT gone according to those rules that *ought* to be sacred in REGULAR TIMES. Necessity has no law, and is a law to itself. If *a company of Christians* find the public worship where they live to be so defiled, that they cannot with a good conscience join in it; and if they do not know of any place to which they can conveniently go, where they may worship God purely and in a regular way; if, I say, *such a body* find some that have been ordained, though to the *lower* functions, should submit itself entirely to their conduct; or find *none* of those, should, by *a common consent*, desire some of their *own number to minister* to them in holy things, and should, upon that beginning, *grow up to a regulated constitution*, though we are very sure that this is quite out of all rule, and could not be done without a very great sin, unless the *necessity* were great and apparent; yet if the necessity is real and not feigned, *this is* NOT CONDEMNED *nor annulled by the article;* for *when this grows to a constitution*, and when it was begun by the CONSENT OF A BODY, who are supposed to have an AUTHORITY in such an *extraordinary* case, whatever some hotter spirits have thought of this since that time, yet *we are very sure* that not only *those who penned the articles*, but the BODY of *this church* for above half an age after did, notwithstanding those *irregularities*, *acknowledge* the FOREIGN CHURCHES *so constituted* to be TRUE *churches*, as to *all the essentials of a church*, though they had been at FIRST *irregularly* formed, and continue to be in an imperfect state. And therefore the general words in which this part of the article is framed seem to have been *designed on purpose not to exclude them*."* This is worthy of the great reformers! I need

* Burnet's account of his work is interesting: "I had been first moved to undertake this work by that great prelate," Tillotson, "who then sat at the helm; and after that, [was] determined in it by a command that was sacred to me by respect, as well as by duty. Our late

not say what a figure Dr. Hook and the Oxford Tract-men cut in the presence of such a statement.

The great reformers and champions of the Reformation knew how to distinguish between what was ESSENTIAL to the FORMATION of a church in *times of difficulty, persecution, or confusion*, and what was prudent, proper, and *orderly* in a *settled* and peaceable state of the church. The following passage from the Epistles of that great reformer, John Calvin, second to none in his day in talents, zeal, and influence in the Reformation, will show this: "Consider this matter fully now,—suppose a person, in a foreign region, desires the opportunity and ability of gathering together a flock for Christ; will not those who are in that place, and who AGREE to *receive* his MINISTRY, by that *very act* of receiving him, ELECT him as their MINISTER, even though *no rite* be used in the matter? I confess, indeed, that where a *due order* of doing such things HAS BEEN

primate lived long enough to see the design finished. He read it over with an exactness that was peculiar to him. He employed some weeks wholly in perusing it, and he corrected it with a care that descended even to the smallest matters; and was such as he thought became the importance of the work. And when that was done, he returned it to me with a letter, that as it was the last I ever received from him, so gave the whole such a character, that how much soever that might raise its value with true judges, yet in decency it must be suppressed by me, as going far beyond what any performance of mine could deserve. He gave so favourable an account of it to our late blessed queen, that she was pleased to tell me she would find leisure to read it; and the last time I was admitted to the honour of waiting on her, she commanded me to bring it to her. But she was soon after that carried to the Source, to the Fountain of life, in whose light she now sees both light and truth. So great a breach as was then made upon all our hopes, put a stop upon this, as well as upon much greater designs."

"This work has lien by me ever since; but has been often not only reviewed by myself, but by much better judges. The late most learned bishop of Worcester," Stillingfleet, "read it very carefully. He marked every thing in it that he thought needed a review; and his censure was in all points submitted to. He expressed himself so well pleased with it, to myself and to some others, that I do not think it becomes me to repeat what he said of it. Both the most reverend archbishops, with several of the bishops, and a great many learned divines, have also read it. I must, indeed, on many accounts own that they may be inclined to favor me too much, and to be too partial to me; yet they looked upon this work as a thing of that importance, that I have reason to believe they read it over severely; and if some small corrections may be taken for an indication that they saw no occasion for greater ones, I had this likewise from several of them."—Preface, pp. 1, 2, fol. Lond., 1699. **These things are important.**

ESTABLISHED in any church, it *ought* to be maintained, fixed, and immovable; but the case is *widely different*, where the very *foundations* have to be laid anew. For what shall we say as to most of the churches raised up by the Lord through Germany? Shall we deny that those who first laboured there in preaching the gospel were received as *true pastors*, though *no rite* accompanied their admission to that office? I do not wish to bind you to the authority of men; but I produce this example as confirming the position I laid down, viz., that the election or appointment of a minister is not necessarily the *same* in an *unsettled* state of a church, as it is where a certain form and order have been already established."* This is the view of the Scriptures, of the earliest fathers, and of the greatest reformers. The contrary opinion is indeed belonging to the very essence of Popery. It is an attempt to make that necessary which God never made so; and then to bind the church to human ordinations, personal succession, episcopal consecrations, priestly absolutions: even while, by undeniable history, many of these men have been wicked, heretics, murderers, simonists, traffickers in the souls and bodies of mankind, shedding the blood of the saints, and leading mankind to destruction!

The case of the English reformers was a difficult one. *They* saw the truth; but a great part of the nation was still under much Popish ignorance. The case very much resembled that of St. Paul with those Jews who were still zealous for the law of Moses. Paul, as a mere prudential measure, took Timothy and circumcised him, rejecting the obligation of circumcision as *essential* to Christianity. The English reformers, as a prudential measure, because of the multitudes who were still zealous for the *ceremonies of Popery*, retained, in form, the ordination and consecration of the *Popish bishops;* not because of their validity and necessity, by divine right, to the existence of the Christian church and Christian ordinances; for they maintained the contrary. The primitive church lived down those Jewish prejudices; and circumcision, even as a circumstance, was utterly put away. The Anglican church should have done the same. It should have gone on to

* Epist., p. 349, edit. Gen., 1575.

declare boldly, that the ordination of its ministers was *based* on the spiritual and *Scriptural qualifications* of the men; upon the *call of God*, moving them by the Holy Ghost to take upon them the ministry; and upon the *call of the church*, solemnly receiving them as the ministers of God, in the gospel of his Son. It has failed to do this; and the strenuous attempts made by many of its erring advocates to maintain the ESSENTIAL importance of *Popish ordinations, episcopal consecration, personal succession*, &c. —these efforts, I say have resulted in a constant leaning to *Popery*, in many divines and members of the Church of England. Wherever and by whomsoever these things are thus maintained, that church becomes *a half-way house to Popery*.

Both the foreign and English reformers had great fears about what was left in the Church of England of Popish origin, lest it should afterward lead to the strengthening of Popery. Cranmer and his coadjutors did what they could, according to the times, and hoped their *successors* would finish what they had begun. Calvin, writing to Cranmer, A. D. 1551, then archbishop of Canterbury, says, "But to speak freely, I greatly fear, and the fear is becoming general here, lest by so much delay, the autumn or harvest should pass, and at length the coldness of a perpetual winter should succeed. You will need to stimulate yourself, as the burden of old age steals upon you; lest in leaving the world your conscience should distress you, because, through some tardiness in proceeding, all things should be left in *confusion*. I mention things as being in confusion, because outward *superstitions* are so corrected as to leave *innumerable branches* that will be constantly sprouting out again. Indeed, I hear that *such* a *mass* of POPISH CORRUPTIONS remain, as not only obscure, but almost bury the pure and genuine worship of God."* That Cranmer was not offended with this plainness is evident, for, in apparently a later letter, Calvin says the archbishop of Canterbury admonished him "that he could not do a more useful thing than to write frequently to the king."† The Popish, and semi-popish bishops and divines, conforming and nonconforming, did their utmost to hinder the removal of these evils. There is a

* Calvini Epist., p. 101. † Page 384.

letter to Calvin from a venerable, aged, sorrowing, and almost dying person on this subject, dated Cambridge, 1550, pp. 96, 97. Zanchy wrote a bold letter to Queen Elizabeth on the Popish vestments, requesting her not to enforce them, 1571. The meek and peaceful Peter Martyr, who spent a long time at Oxford, endeavouring to promote and defend the Reformation, was written to by the venerable Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, on the subject of the Popish vestments. Hooper withstood their use. Martyr, at that time, writing in answer to Hooper's letter, declares he most entirely *approves of their removal*, but thinks that as they were not fundamental matters, they might be *tolerated* for a TIME: and then, afterward, increasing piety in the church would remove them; "for," says he, "if we *first* allow the gospel time to be propagated, and strike deep its roots, men will then perhaps be persuaded better and more easily to remove these external trappings." This letter is dated 1550. However, in a few years he altogether *changed his mind*. Writing to the Popish nobles, (professing to embrace the gospel,) and to their ministers, after recommending them to take care that "no splendour of names or titles, no *kings*, no *fathers*, no *bishops*, no *popes*, no *councils*, &c., should blind their eyes—that the SCRIPTURES ALONE should be the supreme and infallible rule of their faith"—he comes to say, "Use all your vigilance, brethren, that the house of God, defiled, and almost destroyed by antichrist, should be with diligent care *rebuilt*. *Extirpate utterly* all superstitious and false notions. This I the rather admonish, because *I have seen* some who have only cropt the leaves, and flowers, and buds of old superstition, but, having spared the ROOTS, they afterward shot up again to the great injury of the Lord's vineyard. Let all the seeds of evil, and the rottenness of the roots be *extirpated* in the beginning. For if this be *neglected* at the FIRST, (*I know what I say*,) AFTERWARD it will be much more difficult to pluck them up."—February 14th, 1556. And see Bishop Burnet's Letters: the one from Zurich, p. 55, London, 1727, where he shows that the bishops Jewel, Horne, Cranmer, Grindal, took the same views, but that the queen was obstinately opposed to the removal of these things.

SECTION XIV.

GENUINE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

We have now searched this pseudo-apostolical succession scheme to the bottom, and have found it a baseless fabric. Those who have attempted its construction, whatever they might be besides, have in this displayed a disposition to erect a system of *spiritual tyranny* over the whole church of God. Many have been deceived by them. Multitudes of the holiest people upon earth have, in different ages, *suffered bonds, imprisonment, and death*, under the operation of this antichristian scheme. It will be proper to exhibit in a closing section a view of GENUINE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION—the succession of truth and holiness. God has always had a true church; and he always will have a true church. The gates of hell never have prevailed against it; and we are assured by himself that they never shall. This church has always stood, as to its foundation, on the *truth, and faithfulness, and power of God;* and never on any ceremonies or circumstances of church government, or any *order of men: thus it will stand* FOR EVER.

Let us review the past.—In the brief divine history which we have of the antediluvian world, there is no intimation that the church depended on any *order of men*, as ministers of religion. That there were *preachers of righteousness*, is plainly testified in the Scriptures. But from all that we can learn, they were not confined to any uninterrupted succession, nor even initiated by any rite of ordination. They appear to have been good men, who, (blessed with the knowledge of God's favour to themselves, and of his plan of saving sinners,) were moved by the *Holy Ghost* to testify the judgments of God against sin, and his mercy to those who returned to him by repentance, and by trust in that mercy. This was the case for about two thousand years. From the DELUGE to MOSES matters continued in the same state. The priesthood of Aaron was designed to *typify the priesthood of Christ:* as much *oneness*, therefore, and *continuity* was given to it as human things would allow. Hence a *personal succession*, in one

family, was the general principle of the *high priesthood*. Yet this was sometimes changed by *divine direction*; but what is more, it was *broken* and INTERRUPTED by *men*; and yet those who ministered in that office, though *not of the succession* were not repudiated on this account even by our Lord himself, or his apostles. Dr. Hammond, a competent and unexceptionable authority, gives the following account of this matter: "At this time the land being under the Roman emperor, the *succession* of the *high priests* was now CHANGED, the one lineal descendant in the family of Aaron, which was to continue for life, being not permitted to *succeed*, but some other, *whom he pleased*, named to that office *by the Roman procurator* every year, or renewed *as often as he pleased*. To which purpose is that of Theophylact: 'They who were at that time high priests of the Jews, *invaded* that *dignity*, *bought it*, and so destroyed the law, which prescribed a succession in the family of Aaron.' It is manifest, that at this time the Roman *prefect did, ad libitum*, when he would, and that sometimes once a year, put in whom he pleased into the pontificate, to officiate *in Aaron's office*, instead of the lineal descendant from him. And that is it of which *Josephus so frequently makes mention*. After the race of the Assamonaei, it seems Jesus, the son of Phoebes was put in: then he being put out, Simon is put in his stead: this Simon put out, and Matthias in his stead, Ant., l. 17, c. 6,—then Matthias put out by Herod about the time of Christ's birth, and Joazar put in his stead, Ant., l. 17, c. 8,—then Joazar put out by Archelaus, and Eleazar put in, c. 15; and he again put out, and Jesus, the son of Sia, put in. Then in the first of Quirinus, there is mention again of Joazar, son of Boethius, l. 18, c. 1, who it seems was put in, and so turned out again by Quirinus the same year, and Ananus, the son of Seth, put in his stead, who was the Annas here mentioned by St. Luke. Then Gratus, at the beginning of Tiberius's reign, put out Annas and put in Ismael; and in his stead Eleazar, Annas's son: then in his stead Simon; and after his year, Caiaphas here, who continued from that, all his and Pilate's time, till Vitellius displaced him, and put Jonathan, another son of Annas, in his stead; and in his, a year or two after, Theophilus, another son of Annas, whom Agrippa again displaced, Ant., l. xix, c. 5, and

put in Simon; and turning him out the same year, put in Matthias, a fourth son of Annas, in the beginning of Claudius's reign, some nine years after the death of Christ; and soon removed him, put in Elioneus, c. 7. Then it seems Cantharas was put in, for in his place Herod put in Joseph, l. xx, c. 1; and in his stead, about fifteen years after the death of Christ, Ananias, son of Nebedeus, c. 3. After him we find Jonathan, then Ismael, then Joseph, then Annas, another son of Annas, then Jesus, son of Damneus, then Jesus, son of Gamaliel, then Matthias, in whose time the Jewish war began."* Theophylact, we find, says that the law of succession was destroyed by these confusions. Had our succession divines been doctors of the law at the time, they must have made it out that the Church of God then became extinguished; yet we never find a single intimation of the kind by our Lord or his apostles. *From the creation, therefore, to the coming of Christ, the church never was built on any men, or order of men, but was founded in the living God.*

A GOSPEL MINISTRY is God's own positive institution. Ministers are God's gifts to the church. When they are what they ought to be, they are of very great importance and utility; but when any of them become LORDS over God's heritage, God can lay them aside, and their personal succession too, and can raise up others who shall walk more fully after his will, and whose ministry he will confirm and bless by the conversion of sinners and the increased holiness and edification of his people. *This the history of the church in all ages testifies.* Without designing to say one word against *episcopacy*, meaning by that *a prudential and well-guarded superintendency;* or against the simple fact of a succession of ministers, suppose it could be proved to be true,—both of which, if not urged to accomplish purposes of *exclusion and persecution* in the Christian church, may be great blessings; yet let the truth be spoken as to the fact of the operation of episcopacy, *as hitherto established*, and of the scheme of succession as it has existed hitherto in general in the Christian church: both have been at the head of nearly all the oppression and persecution that have been found in the church to the present day. I say, *as they have existed.* But the abuse

* Hammond's note on Luke iii, v. 2.

is no valid argument against the use. I believe abuse very early got into the church in an unguarded and not sufficiently controlled form of episcopacy. It generated into tyranny of the worst kind. *Popery is its genuine offspring.* Great, however, as I acknowledge the abuse to have been, I do still think, that, under just regulations, it might have an important use. The names of kings and tyrants were synonymous in ancient times; and both were alike hated. But what true Englishman will say that the office of king, as supreme civil magistrate, under just regulations, that is, a limited monarchy, is not a blessing? Whoever would say so,—the writer would not. Let episcopacy, then, be placed under such regulations and restraints as shall not admit of any claim of *divine right* on the part of bishops for their superintendency and government. Let those who value episcopacy, and especially the bishops themselves, correct all abuses in the system. The English reformers placed it generally on the right basis: the detail wanted perfecting. Time has shown the defects of the detail: let experience teach wisdom. If these things be not done, *let no man trust an unguarded episcopacy: it will do what it has always done*, viz., DEGENERATE INTO POPERY.

Whenever a *true revival of vital godliness* has taken place, it has usually been done, NOT by the pretended *succession bishops*, but generally *in spite of them:* it has been done—NOT by those whom succession-men assume to have had the *sole* power among mankind of continuing the church of God upon earth; but by those who, according to their absurd scheme, had *no* power to continue it beyond *a single generation*, even if they had so much as that. The Waldenses, in the valleys of the Alps: the Lollards in England: Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Zuingle and Knox: the Puritans in their day; and the Wesleys and Whitefield in still later times, *are all in full proof* of what I say. The English reformers themselves do not constitute an exception to this remark. Who broke up the *fallow ground?* who *sowed the seed of the Reformation* in England? and who *watered* it with their *tears* and with their *blood*, before Henry VIII. quarrelled with the pope? — the bishops? O, no! no! they *imprisoned*, and *shed the blood* of the *saints* like water; but, as an order of min-

isters, they sided with antichrist till Henry quarrelled with the pope. For full proof of all this see Fox's Book of Martyrs. Protestantism had its worst enemies among the apostolical succession bishops. I rejoice to except, *after that time*, and record with due praise, such hallowed names as Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, and Jewel; but they are the *exceptions* and *not the rule*. And it must be confessed that, *since that time*, all the *persecution* of the Puritans and Nonconformists originated generally with the *bishops*. It is intolerable to see the public mind abused by the grandiloquence often employed in speaking about episcopacy as it has existed: the blessing of bishops; of an apostolical ministry coming through the hands of bishops, &c. Grotius has never been suspected of disaffection to episcopacy or bishops; yet he speaks thus plainly—"*Qui ecclesiasticam historiam legit, quid legit nisi episcoporum vitia?*—He who reads ecclesiastical history, what does he read but the vices of bishops?" *

Let us distinguish between what things have been, and what they ought to be. Every true minister is a Scriptural bishop. Every modern bishop is a mere superintendent by the right of human authority. Many excellent men have been found among the bishops. This office is important, and may be highly useful under proper regulations. Hitherto it has been wanting in these regulations in what are called Episcopal churches; and it has been, *on the whole, the source of great evils to the church at large*. Let it be restored to its proper use. Then call that form of church government by what name you please. No wise man will quarrel about names. Against a duly regulated episcopacy, as already explained, we have nothing to say. *Episcopacy by* DIVINE RIGHT *is a modern invention*: it has been the *source of much oppression*. The *personal succession scheme* is a scheme *adopted at present by* BIGOTS for the PURPOSE OF PERSECUTION. We have treated both without ceremony. Both are false—both lead to Popery. The succession of faith is the only succession essential to a Christian church.

Accordingly, the fathers took this as the *only supreme and essential rule of succession*, viz., the *preaching* of the *truth*, of the *faith*, of the *doctrine* taught by the APOSTLES.

* Grotii Epistolæ, No. 22, p. 7. Amstel, 1687.

See the quotations following: also sec. vi. Now who have been distinguished for this apostolic preaching?—the bishops and the great succession-men? By no means! Leave out the first six hundred years: they do not belong to these men: THEIR doctrine of succession was not then held: the only essential succession then maintained was the succession of faith. Since that time—who have been distinguished for apostolical preaching?—the bishops of Rome? Nay, they have generally not preached at all. Bishop Jewel in his day remarked, "These nine hundred years, I say, since Gregory the first of that name, [A. D. 604,] *it can hardly be found that ever any bishop of Rome was seen in a pulpit.*" Sermon on Matt. x, 9. The same thing is true, to a great extent, of all the bishops of that church, and of all the branches of it up to the Reformation. Hear Bishop Jewel again, in his sermon on 1 Cor. iv, 1, 2, "Christ said unto Peter, Lovest thou me? feed my sheep, feed my lambs, feed my flock. But our great clerkes, *our popes, our cardinals, our bishops*, would *seldom or never make a sermon*: they fed not God's sheepe, they fed not God's lambs, they had no regard to God's flocke: and how then would they say, they were the ministers of Christ, and stewards of God's secrets? I leave out much of purpose, good brethren, I wittingly overpasse heere many things else that I could say herein: the *time would faile me*, if I should rehearse unto you *all* those things wherein they have *most shamefully abused themselves*." They were, *as a whole*, the OPPOSERS and CORRUPTERS of the TRUTH. They formed one continued heresy. The apostolical preachers were the Waldenses, the Lollards, Wickliffe, Huss, and their coadjutors: none of them succession bishops, nor their partizans, but the very opposite, and generally out of this pretended succession. *Since the Reformation*, the Protestant churches in general have been out of this pretended succession. Whether the succession were true or false, the early bishops of the Church of England claimed no *exclusive* rights and authority from it. Luther, Calvin, Zuingle, P. Martyr, Melancthon, &c., &c., were not of it, as founders or reformers of churches. Since the time of Bancroft and Laud, the bishops and clergy of the Church of England have been greatly surpassed in apostolical preaching by the Puritans, the Non-

conformists, the dissenters, and the Methodists. The limits of this Essay allow not of an extended comparison, but the thing speaks for itself. Laud's plan, but for the Puritans, would have brought in Popery. The age of mere *rationalism* in preaching was not a match for infidelity. It wanted CHRIST CRUCIFIED, and the DEMONSTRATION of the SPIRIT. The reader may see some good observations and illustrations on the point of rational preaching by the leading divines of the Establishment from about 1700, &c., in the Rev. Edward Bickersteth's excellent work, "The Christian Student," chap. ix, sec. 6. The following passages from that work are strikingly to the point. He quotes Dr. Vicesimus Knox, as saying, in his "Christian Philosophy," that he who receives divine teaching "will find that some of the most learned men, the most voluminous writers on theological subjects, were *totally ignorant of Christianity*. He will find that they were ingenious heathen philosophers, assuming the name of Christians, and *forcibly paganizing* Christianity for the sake of pleasing the world, of extending their fame, and enjoying secular honours and lucrative pre-eminence." Bishop Lavington, says Mr. Bickersteth, may be introduced as another unexceptionable testimony on this subject. This bishop says, addressing the clergy, (somewhere about 1750,) "My brethren, I beg you will rise up with me *against* moral preaching. We have long been attempting the reformation of the nation by discourses of this kind. With what success?—*None at all. On the contrary*, WE HAVE DEXTEROUSLY PREACHED THE PEOPLE INTO DOWNRIGHT INFIDELITY. We must change our voice. We must *preach Christ, and him crucified*. Nothing but the gospel is, nothing besides will be found to be, *the power of God unto salvation*. Let me, therefore, again and again request, may I not add, *let me charge you*, to preach Jesus and salvation through his name."

Mr. Bickersteth is an excellent man, and, on the whole, a candid writer; but it seems to have been too much for him, as it has been for many others, to do any thing like justice to the labours of the Wesleys and Whitefield, as instruments of divine Providence in the glorious revival of religion which has taken place since the beginning of the eighteenth century. Any statement by

the writer, as a Wesleyan, might be thought partial. It may not be amiss, therefore, to give the testimony of the late Dr. Haweis, himself a clergyman, from his History of the Church in the Eighteenth Century. He says, "Through the *moralists* in the pulpit, and the *deists* in the press, Christianity was *reduced to a very emaciated figure*. Even the Dissenters, who affected greater purity of religion, had drunk deep into the *general apostacy*, and sunk into a worldly, careless spirit. The Presbyterians, especially, diverged into the errors of Arianism. The Independents were few, and but little attended to; though among them the *doctrines* were maintained, but in general too cold and dead-hearted; and the Baptists hardly had a name. The Quakers, left to their silent meetings, were declining and forgotten; and the other sects sunk into insignificance. It was in this state of torpor and departure from truth and godliness, [A. D. 1729,] that at Oxford, one of our universities, a few, chiefly young men, began to feel the deplorable spiritual ignorance and corruption around them. JOHN and CHARLES WESLEY, *the first and most distinguished leaders in this revival of evangelical truth*, were brothers: the one, fellow of Lincoln College: the other, student of Christ Church [College.] With these associated a number of other students, whose minds were similarly affected. Mr. Ingham, Mr. Whitefield, and Mr. Hervey, were afterward peculiarly distinguished. The publications which followed them were much affected: a great and visible change was produced in the minds of many. The attention paid to these ministers, and the blessing evident on their labours, roused them to increasing vigorous exertions. They were always at their work, preaching wherever they could procure admittance into the churches.

"Though in age Mr. Whitefield was younger than the Wesleys, yet in zeal and labours he had no superior: his amazing exertions are well known, and the effects of them were prodigious through the whole land. He confined not his ministry to England—Scotland enjoyed the benefit of his visits, and furnished innumerable evidences of the power with which he spoke; nor were his efforts restricted to Britain, but extended to America, whither the *Mr.*

Wesleys had first led the way. Suffice it to observe, that by the labours of these indefatigable men, a flood of gospel light broke upon the nation. At first they were wholly confined to the Church of England, as their attachment to it by education was strong; and had they been fixed in any settled station, they had, not improbably, lived and died good men, useful men, but unnoticed and unknown. A *series of providences* had designed them for greater and more extensive usefulness. The churches growing unable to contain the crowds which flocked after them, Mr. Whitefield first, at Bristol, [1739,] resolved to visit and preach to the wild colliers in the wood, who had seldom attended any worship; and his signal success among them encouraged his persevering efforts. On his return to London, he used the same means of field-preaching at Kennington Common and Moorfields, being now generally excluded from the churches, to which he had himself somewhat contributed, by perhaps too severe animadversions on the clergy, as well as the envy and disgust that his singular popularity had occasioned.

"Nor were Mr. John Wesley and his brother Charles less zealously employed, but also took the field and preached everywhere. The congregations under the canopy of heaven were prodigious: sometimes, indeed, riotous and insulting, but in general solemn and attentive. By these labours multitudes were daily added to the church of such as should be saved." Then, after giving an account of the doctrines and discipline of the Calvinistic and Wesleyan Methodists, he adds, "It is observable, that all these great bodies, though driven to worship in places of their own erection, in order to secure the preaching of such evangelical principles as they cannot find in the churches in general, would be happy to have the cause removed that hath compelled them to these expedients; and were the bishops and clergy zealous to inculcate the great fundamentals of gospel truth, and to adorn the doctrine by a life of spiritual religion, the greater part of these partial seceders would probably return to the forms and worship of the Established Church. As it is, their numbers every day increase; and while carelessness and lukewarmness cause the noblest edifices to be deserted, every

little meeting is crowded with hearers, whenever a minister, earnest and evangelical, labours from his heart for the salvation of men's souls.

"Such has been the progress of what is called *Methodism* in the greater bodies that more immediately bear that name; but it has spread in a prodigious manner, both among those of the Church, as well as the dissenters from it, and *has been the means of rekindling the zeal of very many*, so as to produce a vast alteration for the better in the conduct of thousands and tens of thousands. Predilection for the Establishment strongly attaches many to it, who have received their *religious impressions from one or other of these Methodist societies*, or from some of their own clergy, who lie under the imputation of being *methodistically inclined*, that is, such as literally and with apparent zeal inculcate the doctrinal articles they have subscribed, and live in a state of greater piety and separation from the world, than the generality of their brethren. The number of these is of late amazingly increased. Where before scarcely a man of this stamp could be found, some hundreds, as rectors or curates in the Established Church, inculcate the doctrines which are branded with *Methodism;* and everywhere, throughout the kingdom, one or more, and sometimes several, are to be found within the compass of a few miles, who approve themselves faithful labourers in the Lord's vineyard. They naturally associate among themselves, and separate from the corruption which is in the world. Everywhere they carry the stamp of peculiarity, and are marked by their brethren. Though carefully conforming to established rules, and strictly regular, they are everywhere objects of reproach, because their conduct cannot but reflect on those who choose not to follow such examples. They pay conscientious attention to the souls of their parishioners: converse with them on spiritual subjects wherever they visit: encourage prayer and praise in the several families under their care: often meet them for these purposes; and engage them to meet and edify one another. Their exemplary conversation procures them reverence from the poor of the flock, as their faithful rebukes often bring upon them the displeasure of the worldling, the dissipated, and the careless. They join in none of the fashionable amusements of the age, fre-

quent not the theatres or scenes of dissipation, court no favour of the great, or human respects: their time and services are better employed in the more important labours of the ministry, preaching the word in season, out of season, and counting their work their best wages. They labour, indeed, under many discouragements. All the superior orders of the clergy shun their society. They have been often treated by their *diocesans* with much insolence and oppression. They can number *no bishop*, nor scarcely a dignitary among them. Yet their number, strength, and respectability, continue increasing. May they grow into a host, like the host of God!"

The whole view of these facts goes to show, to demonstrate, that God never confined his church to personal successions and episcopal consecrations; but the very reverse. The chief persons in this pretended succession have been the principal corrupters and opposers of the truth. Whenever gospel *truth* has been preserved against *error*, and a REAL REVIVAL of apostolic faith and gospel holiness has been brought about, God has employed men NOT *in this scheme of succession*. THE GOSPEL WOULD HAVE PERISHED IF LEFT TO THIS SUCCESSION. Man corrupts every thing. He is not to be trusted with so precious a treasure as Christianity. God keeps his own work in his own hands. *He and he only holds the* KEYS *to the ministry of his word*. He lets *no wolves*, no *wicked men*, into his fold. When a regular ministry is Scriptural and pious, God greatly blesses it: it is an unspeakable blessing to the Church. *But when ministers forsake God, God forsakes them*. He then raises up others: he sets his own seal to their piety, doctrine, labours, and sufferings, by making them abundantly successful in the conversion of sinners, and in the edification and extension of his church. The residue of the Spirit is with him. The hearts of all men are in his keeping. He can raise up and qualify instruments for his work from any quarter. The fishermen of Galilee—the poor men of Lyons—the Huguenots in France—the Lollards in England—Luther, the monk, in Germany—the Wesleys at Oxford—these, these have been God's instruments! Well! let all human schemes perish in their turn, when abused to prevent the progress of gospel truth and holiness. The Lord liveth! blessed be his

holy name! Blessed be his name for his servants, for his martyrs, his confessors, his holy ministers of every name; above all, blessed be his holy name, for the unspeakable gift of his holy TRUTH transmitted by the SACRED SCRIPTURES, and a holy ministry from generation to generation! May it more than ever prevail! and may the earth be filled with his glory! Amen! Amen!

The only true succession essential to the existence of a Christian church, then, is the succession of FAITH, of truth of doctrine, and holiness of life. We shall insert some noble TESTIMONIES on this point, and then conclude the subject.

IRENÆUS:—"In the very book in which he employs the argument of succession, he says he brings his '*demonstrations*,' not from persons, but 'from the *Scriptures*:'—which Scriptures are henceforward to be the *foundation* and *pillar* of our faith. In book iv, c. 43–5, he says, we are 'to *obey* those presbyters who have the divine gift of the *faith*:' that we are 'to *forsake*' all *wicked* ministers; and are to learn from such as have this divine gift of the *truth*."

TERTULLIAN:—"But if the heretics feign or *fabricate* such a [personal] *succession*, this will NOT help them. For their DOCTRINE *itself*, compared with the doctrine of the apostles, will, by its own diversity and contrariety, *pronounce against them*. To THIS *form* of trial will appeal be made by those churches *henceforward* daily establishing, which, though they have neither any of the apostles, nor apostolical men for their founders, yet all *agreeing* in the SAME FAITH, are, from this consanguinity of doctrine, to be esteemed *not the less apostolical* than the former."*

CYPRIAN:—Referring to Stephen, bishop of Rome, pleading *tradition* for what Cyprian believed to be a great error, answers, "What does he mean by tradition? Does he mean the authority of *Christ* in the *Gospels*, and of the *apostles* in their *Epistles?*—let this tradition be sacred; for if we return to this *Head* and *Original* of divine tradition, human error will cease. If the channel of the water of life, at first coming down in large and copious flow, should *suddenly fail*, should we not return to the FOUNTAIN?—If the channel becomes corrupted and leaky, so that the

*De Præscript, c. 32.

water does not flow constantly and regularly, it must be *repaired* in order to the supply of water to the citizens coming down from the *Fountain*. This ought the ministers of God now to do, observing as their RULE the divine precepts, that if any thing has tottered and shaken from the truth, it should be restored to the authority of Christ, the evangelists, and the apostles; and all our proceedings are to take their RISE there, whence all order and divine authority rise—FOR CUSTOM WITHOUT TRUTH IS ONLY ANTIQUATED ERROR. Therefore, forsaking error, let us follow the truth, knowing that, as in Esdras's opinion, truth is victorious, so it is written, 'truth remains and prevails for ever,' it lives and reigns through endless ages. Neither is there with truth any distinction or respect of persons, but only that which is just it ratifies; neither is there in the jurisdiction of truth any iniquity; but the strength, and dominion, and the majesty and power of all generations. Blessed be the God of truth! This truth Christ shows in the gospel, saying, 'I am the truth.' Therefore, if we be in Christ and Christ in us; if we remain in the truth, and the truth abide in us, let us hold those things which are of the truth." *

GREGORY NAZIANZEN:—In his Oration in praise of Athanasius, speaking of his election as bishop of Alexandria to the chair of St. Mark, the evangelist, who is supposed to have founded that church, says that Athanasius was "not less the successor of St. Mark's piety, than he was of his pre-eminence. For if," says he, "you consider Athanasius only as one in the number of bishops of Alexandria, he was the most remote from St. Mark; but if you regard his piety, you find him the very next to him. *This succession of piety* ought to be esteemed the true succession. For he who maintains the *same* doctrine of *faith*, is *partner* in the *same chair;* but he who defends a contrary doctrine, ought, though in the chair of St. Mark, to be esteemed an *adversary* to it. This man, indeed, may have a *nominal* succession, but the other has the *very thing itself*, the SUCCESSION IN DEED AND IN TRUTH. Neither is he who *usurps* the chair by violent means to be esteemed in the succession; but he who is pressed into the office: not he who *violates all law in his election*, but he who is

* Epist. 74, edit. Pamel., 1589.

elected in a manner consistent with the laws of the case: not he who holds *doctrines opposed* to what St. Mark taught, but he who is endued with the SAME FAITH as St. Mark. Except, indeed, you intend to maintain SUCH *a succession* as that of *sickness* succeeding to *health: light* succeeding to *darkness:* a *storm* to a *calm;* and *madness* succeeding to *soundness of mind!* It was not with Athanasius as it is sometimes with tyrants, who, being suddenly raised to the throne, break out into acts of violence and excess: such conduct as this is the mark of *adulterate and spurious bishops*, and who are unworthy of the dignity to which they are raised. These having no previous qualifications for their office, never having borne the trials of virtue, commence *disciples and masters* at the same time, and attempt to *consecrate others while unholy themselves.* Yesterday they were guilty of sacrilege—to-day they are made ministers of the sanctuary: yesterday they were ungodly —to-day they are made reverend fathers in God: old in sin, ignorant of piety, and having proceeded by violence in all the rest, (as not being influenced by divine but human motives,) they *crown the whole* by EXERCISING THEIR TYRANNY UPON PIETY ITSELF." *

ST. AMBROSE:—"They have not the inheritance, are not the successors of Peter, who have not Peter's faith."†

CALVIN:—"We have pretty opponents to deal with, who, when they are clearly convicted of corrupting the doctrines and worship of Christianity, then take shelter under the pretence that no molestation ought to be offered to the *successors of the apostles.* Now, this question of being successors of the apostles must be decided by an *examination of the* DOCTRINES maintained. To this examination, confident of the goodness of our cause, we cheerfully appeal. Let them not reply, that they have a right to *assume* that their doctrine is apostolic; for *this is begging the question.* What! shall they, who have all things contrary to the apostles, prove they are their true successors, solely by the continuance of time? As well might a murderer, having slain the master of the house and taken possession of the same, maintain that he was the lawful heir. The popedom, indeed, differs more from that government

* Athanasii Opp., vol. ii, Appendix, edit. Paris, 1627.
† Le Pœnitentia, lib. i, cap. 6.

which the apostles, established, then the most cruel and bloody tyranny ever differed from the best constituted government for the establishment of civil liberty. Who would tolerate the tyrant, that, having murdered the rightful sovereign, only gloried in the usurpation of his name? No less is their impudence, who having ruined that government which Christ commanded and the apostles established, make *a pretence of succession* for the support of their tyranny. For, suppose that such *an unbroken line*, as they pretend, really existed, yet if their apostleship had perished, (and it necessarily did by their corruption of God's worship, by their destruction of the offices of Christ, by the extinction of the light of doctrine among them, and the pollution of the sacrament,) what then becomes of their succession? Except, indeed, as an heir succeeds to the dead, so they, true piety being extinct among them, succeed to domination. But seeing they have changed entirely the government of the church, the *chasm* between them and the apostles is so vast as to exclude any communication of right from the one to the other. And to conclude the point in one word, *I deny the succession scheme, as a thing utterly without foundation.*"*

MELANCTHON :—"The church is *not bound* to an ordinary SUCCESSION, as they call it, of bishops, *but* to the GOSPEL. When *bishops do not teach the* TRUTH, an ordinary SUCCESSION avails nothing to the church : they ought of necessity to be forsaken."†

PETER MARTYR :—"It is a most trifling thing which they" [the Papists] "object against us," [the reformers,] "that we want the right *succession*. It is quite enough for us that we have *succeeded* to the FAITH which the apostles taught, and which was maintained by the holy fathers in the best ages of the church."‡

ZANCHIUS :—"For we know that, as, on the one hand, where *true doctrine* ALONE, *without* a continued succession of bishops from the beginning, can be shown to exist, there is a true church, and a true and legitimate ministry : so, on the other hand, where *personal succession alone is boasted of*, the purity of true Christian doctrine having

* Calvini Vera Eccles. Ref. Ratio.
† Loci Com. de Signis monst. Eccles., ed. Erlang., 1838.
‡ Loci Com., class. iv, cap. I.

departed, there is NO *legitimate* ministry: seeing that both the church, and the ministry of the church, are *bound* NOT to *persons*, but to the *word* of God."*

BRADFORD the MARTYR:—The Popish archdeacon, Harpsfield, is examining him. "*Harpsfield*: It (the Romish church) hath also *succession of bishops*. And here he made much ado to prove that this was an *essential* point. *Bradford*: You say as you would have it; for if this point fail you, all the church that you go about to set up will fall down. YOU WILL NOT FIND IN ALL THE SCRIPTURE THIS YOUR ESSENTIAL POINT OF THE SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS. In Christ's church antichrist will sit.—The ministry of God's word and ministers be an essential point. But to translate this to the bishops and their succession, is a plain subtilty. And therefore that it may be plain, I will ask you a question,—Tell me, whether that the Scripture knew *any difference* between *bishops and ministers*, which ye call priests, [presbyters?] *Harpsfield*: No. *Bradford*: Well, then go on forward and let us see what ye will get now by the succession of bishops, that is, of ministers, which can be understood of such bishops as minister *not* but *lord it*. *Harpsfield*: *I perceive that ye are far out of the way*. *Bradford*: If Christ or his apostles being here on earth had been required by the prelates of the church then, to have made a demonstration of that church by succession of *such* high priests as had approved the doctrines which he taught, I think that Christ would have done, as I do, that is, [he would] have alleged that which upholdeth the church, even the VERITY, the WORD OF GOD taught and believed, *not* by the high priests which of long time had persecuted it, but by the prophets and other good simple men, *which perchance were counted for heretics of the church* which church was *not tied to succession, but to the word of God.*"†

BISHOP JEWEL:—"The grace of God is promised to pious souls, and to those who fear God, and is *not* affixed to *bishops' chairs*, and [personal] *succession*."—Apology. "For that ye tell so many fair tales about Peter's succession, we demand of you wherein the pope succeedeth Peter? You answer, he succeeded him in his chair; as

* Zanchii (confessio) Fidei, cap. 25, sec. 19.

† Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. 3, p. 293, &c., fol. ed. 1641.

if Peter had been some time installed in Rome, and had solemnly sat all day with his triple crown, in his *pontificalibus*, and in a chair of gold. And thus, *having lost* both RELIGION and DOCTRINE, ye think it sufficient, at last, to hold by the CHAIR, as if a soldier that had lost his sword, would play the man with his scabbard. But so Caiaphas succeeded Aaron: so wicked Manasses succeeded David: so *may* ANTICHRIST easily sit in PETER'S CHAIR." *

WHITAKER:—After briefly noticing Bellarmine's reference to the fathers, Irenæus, Tertullian, &c., he replies, "In the first place, I answer in general, that I might *justly reject all these human testimonies, and require some clear testimony out of the Scriptures.* For this is the constant determination of all the catholic fathers, that nothing is to be received or approved in religion which does not rest on the testimony of Scripture, and which cannot be proved and established by the Scriptures. But the fathers did *not* use this argument of personal succession as a firm and solid argument *of itself*, but as a kind of illustration of their main argument: they did not employ it to win the battle, but by way of triumph after victory. For when they had, by solid and powerful arguments, *out of the Scriptures*, conquered their enemies, and established their cause, then, by way of triumph, they brought forward the succession of bishops in this manner: the bishops hold this faith as they received it from the apostles; therefore this is the catholic faith. This argument proves not that the succession of persons alone is conclusive, or sufficient of itself; but only that it avails when they had first proved (from the Scriptures) that the faith they preached was the same faith which the apostles had preached before them. FAITH, therefore, is as it were, the *soul* of the succession: which faith being wanting, the naked succession of persons is like *a dead carcase without the soul.*" †

FIELD:—"Thus still we see that *truth of doctrine* is a necessary note whereby the church must be known and discerned, and not ministry or succession, or any thing else, without it." ‡

WHITE:—The Jesuit objects that "The Protestant

* Defence of Apology, p. 634, ed. 1609.
† Whitakeri Opp. vol. i, p. 506, fol. ed. Genev. 1610.
‡ Field on the Church, book ii, chap. vi.

church is not apostolic, because they cannot derive their pedigree lineally without interruption from the apostles, as the Roman church can from St. Peter, but are enforced to acknowledge some other, as Calvin, or Luther, or some such," &c. Query — have not Dr. Hook, Mr. Palmer, &c., stolen their objections to the churches of the Reformation from the Jesuits' school? White says, "Our answer is, that the succession required to make a church apostolike, must be defined by the *doctrine* and not by the *place* or *persons*.— *Wheresoever the true faith contained in the Scriptures is professed and embraced, there is the whole and full nature of an apostolike church.*—FOR THE EXTERNAL SUCCESSION WE CARE NOT." *

FRANCIS WHITE, BISHOP OF ELY:—"The true visible church is named apostolical, not because of local and personal succession of bishops, (only or principally,) but because it retaineth the *faith* and *doctrine* of the apostles. Personal or local succession only, and in itself, maketh not the church apostolical, because *hirelings and wolves* may lineally succeed lawful and orthodox pastors: Acts xx, 29, 30. *Even as sickness succeedeth health, and darkness light, and a tempest fair weather*, as Gregory Nazianzen affirmeth." †

STILLINGFLEET:—"Come we, therefore, to Rome; and here the succession is as *muddy* as the Tiber itself. Then let succession know its place, and learn to vaile bonnet to the Scriptures. The succession so much pleaded by the writers of the primitive church, was *not a succession of persons in apostolical power, but* A SUCCESSION IN APOSTOLICAL DOCTRINE." ‡

BISHOP HALL:—"First, we may not either have or expect now in the church, that ministry which Christ set: where are our apostles, prophets, evangelists? If we must always look for the very same administration of the church which our Saviour left, why do we not acknowledge these *extraordinary* functions? Do we not rather think, since it pleased him to begin with those offices which should NOT *continue*, that herein he purposely intended to teach us, that if we have the *same heavenly business done*, we should

* White's Way to the True Church, sec. 52, ed. 1612.
† Bishop White's Works, p, 64, fol. ed. 1624.
‡ Stillingfleet's Irenicum, pp. 297, 303, 322, edit. 1662.

not be *curious* in the *circumstances* of the persons? But for those *ordinary* callings of pastors and doctors, (intended to perpetuities) with what forehead can he deny them to be in our church? How many have we that conscionably teach and feed, or rather feed by teaching? *Call them what you please. Superintendents*, (that is,) bishops, prelates, priests, lecturers, parsons, vicars, &c. IF THEY PREACH CHRIST TRULY, upon true inward abilities, upon a *sufficient* [if not perfect] outward vocation, such a one [*all histories witness*] for the substance, as hath been ever in the church since the apostles' times, they are pastors and doctors *allowed by Christ. We stand not upon circumstances and appendances* of the *fashions* of *ordination*, manner of choice, attire, *titles*, maintenance; *but if for substance these be* NOT *true pastors and doctors, Christ had* NEVER *any in his church since the apostles left the earth.*" * Again, speaking of the reformed churches and their government and ministers, Calvin, Beza, &c., and of the Church of England, he says to his opponent, "Why, like a true MAKE-BATE, do you *not* say, that our churches have so *renounced* their government? THESE SISTERS"—the Church of England and the reformed churches—"*have learned to differ, and yet to love and reverence each other;* and in these cases to enjoy their own forms *without prescription of necessity* OR CENSURE." †

The REV. J. WESLEY:—"I deny that the Romish bishops came down by *uninterrupted succession* from the apostles. I never could see it proved; and I am persuaded I never shall. But unless this is proved, your own pastors, on your principles, are no pastors at all." ‡ "The figment of the uninterrupted succession, he openly said 'he knew to be *a fable.*'" §

Here is a glorious army of MARTYRS and CONFESSORS, venerable FATHERS and REFORMERS, bearing testimony to the *only essential* succession, the succession of *apostolical* DOCTRINE!

Truth and holiness, then, are the only infallible, essential properties or signs of the church of God; and the Scriptures are the ONLY *infallible rule* of this truth and

* Bishop Hall's Apology against Brownists, sec. 27. † Ibid. sec. 31.
‡ Wesley's Works, vol. 3, p. 44, ed. 1829.
§ Watson's Life of Wesley, p. 286, 12mo. 1831.

holiness. God gives ministers to his church, as the means of leading men to the knowledge and belief of this truth, and to live accordingly; but every man is required, at the peril of his soul, to believe, not in man, but in God: not in ministers, but in the Scriptures. So saith St. Augustine: "*Nunquam aliquis apostolorum dicere auderet, qui credit in me. Credimus apostolo, sed non credimus* IN *apostolum.*—No apostle ever dared to say 'He who believes in me.' We believe an apostle, but we do not believe *in* an apostle."*

It follows, as a consequence, that as every man is to *believe* for himself, every man is to *judge* for himself. The Papists say that God has made the church the infallible guide in matters of faith. God never said so. Let no man deceive himself. But the position is a sophism from beginning to end: it takes for granted what ought to be proved. It takes for granted that ministers, bishops, and priests, are the church. This is contrary to the Scriptures. When our Lord said to Peter, "On *this rock* will I build my *church*," the Papists say, that he meant he would build his church upon Peter and his successors, that is, upon the bishops of Rome, and the other bishops and priests under them. Build what, upon Peter and his successors? Why, if bishops and priests are the church, that he would build bishops and priests upon bishops and priests! Peter upon Peter! that he would *build a thing upon itself!* This is hardly equalled by the poor South Sea islanders, *building the world upon a turtle, and the turtle upon nothing!* Our Lord's meaning was, that his church, his faithful people should be founded upon the truth of his being the Messiah, the Son of the living God. When the apostle addresses the presbyters or bishops of Ephesus—"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the *church of God*, which he hath purchased with his own blood," Acts xx, 28, he clearly makes the "*church* of God" to mean "the *flock*," as *distinguished* FROM the *shepherds*: that is, the PEOPLE *as distinguished* FROM the MINISTERS. It is true, indeed, that ministers are a part of the church generally; but to say that *they are the church*, and upon

* Augustini Opp. v, 9, Tract 54, in Evang. Joan. p. 133, ed. Ludg. 1664.

this partial statement to found a most awfully important claim, the claim of *infallibility* and *lordship* over the *faith of all* the people of God, is a daring, false, and impious position !—SUCH IS THE FOUNDATION OF POPERY. But they say, the right of *private judgment runs into sects and heresies*, and they make a mighty parade about this. Perhaps many of them do not understand what they say. This is their best excuse. If they mean to say that the Protestant churches have, as to the succession of faith, as taught by the apostles, gone into *sects* and *heresies*, let them show a single *true* Protestant society that does not hold and teach what the apostles held and taught. As they boast of the *fathers*, let them produce a *single creed* from any of the fathers, for the first three hundred years, that is not believed by every *true* Protestant church. Now if they cannot do this, where is the honesty of talking about sects and heresies arising from private judgment? But we turn the tables upon the Papists: they have added many articles to the creed which the apostles never taught: they have corrupted the truth of God and perverted the gospel. They have brought heresies and idolatry into the church by wholesale. No Popish priest under heaven can prove the Popish creed of Pope Pius IV. (the *universal creed* of the Popish Church) from the Scriptures, nor from the fathers of the *first* three hundred years. They have lost the succession of faith. That *church* is in a state of *heresy and idolatry:* it is an APOSTATE CHURCH!

The priesthood of Papists and high Churchmen may be an imitation of Judaism or Paganism, or it may be a compound of both; but it is not, as a priesthood, the Christian ministry; and no man in it is a gospel minister at all, any further than he is such according to the above principles of Protestantism. The priesthood of Papists and high Churchmen professedly and essentially depends upon an uninterrupted succession of bishops, to be traced in an unbroken series from Peter to the present day; and upon the authority of episcopal consecrations, or ordinations as episcopal. Now no such uninterrupted succession exists. Episcopal consecration or ordination, *as such*, that is, as distinct from the power of their order as presbyters, is *a mere ceremony:* it has no scriptural validity whatever. Both Popery and high Churchism erect in the priesthood a

system of *spiritual tyranny* over the whole church of God. The succession here is, as Gregory Nazianzen describes it, "the succession of sickness to health: light succeeding to darkness: a storm to a calm; and spiritual derangement to the spirit of health, and of love, and of a sound mind." Or, as Bishop Jewel states it, "it is like Caiaphas succeeding to Aaron: Manasses succeeding to David; or antichrist sitting in Peter's chair."

The Protestant churches are *one* in their rule of faith. Chillingworth's immortal words shall be here inserted: "Know then, sir, that when I say the religion of Protestants is in prudence to be preferred before yours, as, on the one side, I do not understand by your religion the doctrine of Bellarmine, or Baronius, or any other private man among you, nor the doctrine of the Sorbon, or of the Jesuits, or of the Dominicans, or of any other particular company among you, but that wherein you all agree, or profess to agree, *the doctrine of the* COUNCIL OF TRENT: so accordingly, on the other side, by the religion of Protestants, I do *not* understand the doctrine of Luther, or Calvin, or Melancthon; nor the confession of Augusta, or Geneva; nor the Catechism of Heidleberg; nor the Articles of the Church of England: no, nor the harmony of Protestant confessions; but that wherein they all agree, and which they all subscribe with a greater harmony, as a perfect rule of their faith and actions, that is, the BIBLE. The BIBLE, I say, the BIBLE *only* is the religion of Protestants! Whatsoever else they believe besides it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable consequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of opinion; but as matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require the belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical presumption. I, for my part, after a long and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial search of the true way to eternal happiness, do profess plainly, that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot, but upon THIS ROCK only. I see plainly, and with mine own eyes, that there are *popes against popes*, *councils against councils*, *some fathers against others*, the *same fathers against themselves*, a *consent* of fathers of one age *against a consent* of fathers of another age, the *church* of one age *against the church* of

another age. Traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found: no tradition but only of Scripture, can derive itself from the fountain; but may be plainly proved, either to have been brought in, in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of *Scripture* ONLY, for any considering man to build upon. This, therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe: this I will profess: according to this I will live; and for this, if there be occasion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly, lose my life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. Propose me any thing out of this book, and require whether I believe it or no, and seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this,—God hath said so, therefore it is true. In other things, I will take no man's liberty of judgment from him; neither shall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worse man, nor the worse Christian: I will love no man the less for differing in opinion from me. And what measure I mete to others I expect from them again. I am fully assured that God does not, and therefore that men ought not, to require any more of any man than this, to believe the Scriptures to be God's word, to endeavour to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it."*

The true Protestant churches, then, have the true succession, the succession of the faith of the apostles, the doctrine of truth as taught by the apostles. This is in the Bible, and in the Bible alone. All held besides this, as *articles of faith*, or as *divinely binding in obedience*, is a CORRUPTION of CHRISTIANITY.

Let the Protestant churches remember their high privileges: let them bless God for them, and endeavour to the utmost to keep their trust pure and undefiled. Let the PEOPLE HONOR THEIR MINISTERS AS AMBASSADORS FOR CHRIST. The *great aim of Papists and Semi-Papists* is to lead the people to DESPISE THEIR MINISTERS. *Why* do they do this? Why? that they may make *a prey* of the people. Do they offer to *feed* them as pastors?—it will be with the *husks* of *tradition*. Do they claim to

* The Religion of Protestants, c. 6, sec. 56.

govern them?—it will be as *lords* over God's heritage. Do they offer them *liberty?*—it is that they may lead them to *bondage*. God has made the Protestant churches free: may they stand fast in their liberty, and never be entangled again with the yoke of bondage!

God has always had a church, a spiritual people: he always will have a spiritual people, *a true church*. This church is a *holy* church: no body of people, as distinguished by human arrangements, is so. Ungodly people are found among all denominations: most *particularly* among Papists and high Churchmen.

The church of God is a *catholic* church, consisting of *all* the true worshippers of God *everywhere:* no denomination of Christians ever was catholic, that is, universal. The expression, *Roman Catholic*, is a solecism—is nonsense—is absurd! It is as much as to say, a PARTICULAR UNIVERSAL, that A PART IS THE WHOLE, that A CITY IS THE WORLD!!

The true Catholic church is the same in *all ages*, as well as in *all places*. It is made up of patriarchs and prophets, martyrs and confessors, and true believers: "I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven," Matt. viii, 11. "After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb," Rev. vii, 9, 10.

CONCLUSION.

THE argument of this Essay is now finished; and the high Church scheme of an order of bishops, *by divine right*, distinct from and superior to presbyters; possessing prerogatives incompatible with presbyters; having the rights and authority of apostles: which order of bishops is to be traced by a PERSONAL *succession*, through an *unbroken line* from Peter to the present bishops of England; and whose *ordinations* are so *essential* to the validity of a true gospel ministry, that without them all preaching and ordinances are "VAIN," and *without the "promise of Christ:"* this scheme has been examined in its fundamental positions, and has been shown to be a BASELESS FABRIC, calculated only to destroy the peace of the church, and to promote pride, bigotry, exclusiveness, intolerance, and persecution; in one word, TO DESTROY PROTESTANTISM, AND TO PROMOTE POPERY. It has been proved, on the other hand, with all the evidence of a catholic or universal doctrine of the Christian church, that bishops and presbyters are, by *divine right*, ONE and the SAME. Presbyters have been shown by the Scriptures, the *only and sufficient authority* in such matters, to have by DIVINE RIGHT, EQUAL power and authority with any bishops to perform ALL the acts of the Christian ministry: instancing, especially, that of ORDAINING ministers. Presbyters are equally as much successors of the apostles as bishops are. The only *essential* succession is the succession of FAITH. All churches are *apostolical* or not, in proportion as they approach to, or recede from, the *doctrine* of the apostles. An unbroken line of *personal* descent of *spiritual power* to ordain in the English bishops, is *a fable*. No man ever did, or ever can prove it. In addition to all this, we have shown, that when examined by the Scriptures, and the doctrine of the reformers, the POPISH *ordinations* of the English bishops, before and at the Reformation, were, from the *monstrous*, *wickedness*, *heresy*, and *simony* of the persons concerned, NULL and VOID to all intents and purposes.

The validity of the ordination of the ministers of the Church of England, as well as that of the ministers of all other churches, must be judged, therefore, according to the Scriptural rule of the succession of doctrine: the *qualifications* of the men in personal *piety*, *ability* to teach, *ministerial grace*, the *call of God*, and their appointment to the work in a manner suitable to the Scriptures.

A few brief observations, as COROLLARIES, may be added.

Ministers are *God's gifts*, and God's stewards in the church:—

The Scriptures regularly speak in this style:—The *Lord sends* the labourers into his vineyard. Matt. ix, 28. The *Lord appoints* ministers as the stewards of his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season. Matt. xii, 42. *Jesus*, as the chief Shepherd, *brings* in by *himself*, as the door, *all true shepherds*. When he ascended up on high, HE *gave* to the church pastors, &c. Ephes. iv, 11, 12. They are to *rule* by HIS word and will. Their office, we have shown, is a *limited* office: they are *servants*, not *masters*, nor *lords* over the heritage. *None* but such as these can be true ministers of the gospel. GOD QUALIFIES THEM, MOVES THEM, AND SENDS THEM. Where no church is formed, they gather one. Where churches are formed, he moves and directs his church, if attentive to his will, to receive all he sends.

Every minister of the gospel must be a real Christian, not a wicked man: a man of some natural ability, not a fool: endowed with knowledge of the gospel, not a novice: able to teach and to convince gainsayers. Besides all this, he must have a special gift of the Holy Ghost for the work. Rom. xii, 6: 1 Cor. xii, 4–7: Ephes. iv, 7, &c. Every such man has a *divine commission in* GENERAL to preach the gospel; but he has *no* AUTHORITY in any PARTICULAR *church*, as *a pastor* or *governor* over that church. To constitute him a regular pastor in a particular church, he must be solemnly received as such by the regular authority of that church. The mode of constituting a minister in a particular church may vary according to circumstances. If it be in a state of persecution, or reformation, the full reception of his ministry establishes him as the minister of that church; if it be in a settled state, he must be constituted or instituted a minister according to the

usages of that church. Scripture, and all antiquity, and the generality of the reformed churches, show this should be done by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, that is, of those ministers appointed for their wisdom, gravity, and experience to such office in the church. Only it should be kept in mind, that this form, though authorized by such high examples, is never commanded. It is becoming and proper, but not essential. It is pretty clear that the early ordinations were sometimes performed by the lifting up of the hands of those who ordained.* So the word χειροτονεω, used in the ordaining of elders or presbyters in all the churches by Paul and Barnabas, properly means. Acts xiv, 23. Any act, indeed, by the authority of the church, setting men apart to this office, is ordination. This public authorized act is all that belongs to the essence of ordination: all besides is accident or circumstance. ALL MINISTERS are EQUAL, by DIVINE RIGHT, in every thing that belongs to the being or well-being of the church. The church may arrange for one or more to perform, for the sake of order, any particular duty, so that no attempt is made to claim for such acts or arrangements *more* than *human* authority. The moment this is done, such a claim makes *war* on the *rights* of other *ministers*, and on the *peace* of the *church*.

The EFFICACY of a gospel ministry depends, *as to God*, upon the authority and power of the *word* of God, and upon the operations of the SPIRIT of God; and, as to man, upon the *faith* and *obedience* of the hearers. The *mere preaching*

* I am aware that attempts have been made to refute this, by saying that the word χειροτονεω means to institute a person in some office. Very true. So balloting or voting frequently does the same. But this is only *part* of the truth. Expressions of this kind frequently declare the *manner* of doing this, as well as the thing itself: *so voting by a show of hands* expresses the manner, as well as the thing. The Greeks, from whom the word is taken, frequently instituted individuals in office by a *show of hands*. The text in Acts xiv, 23, uses the very word applied to the institution of an individual in office among the Greeks, *by a show of hands*. Among them, therefore, it signified to ordain or appoint to office by *a show of hands*. The sacred writer says that *Paul and Barnabas thus instituted*, that is, *ordained, presbyters* in every church: they ordained them, therefore, by lifting up their hands in solemn attestation that they so instituted them as ministers of the word. Such seems to be the legitimate conclusion both from the *language*, and from the *customs* of the Greeks.

and administering of sacraments, as the ACT of the MINISTER, has in itself no saving efficacy. The *opus operatum*, or the doctrine of Papists and high Churchmen, that the *mere outward performance* of the offices and ordinances of religion necessarily produces inward religion, is PRIESTCRAFT, and *destroys* many of the SOULS of the people. The blind lead the blind, and both fall into the ditch. This *abuse* of the ministry of the gospel is no argument against its *use* and importance. The gospel ministry is God's ordinance. It is a highly important ordinance; and, when properly performed, is highly useful. Is it not vastly important to know, that God has sent to us ambassadors of peace; though the authority, and power, and efficacy of this embassy are really all divine? Is it not highly useful to find, that, as to those who *believe* and *obey that embassy*, GOD WILL RECEIVE them *by it* into *pardon and peace:* to holiness and heaven? "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but *ministers* by whom ye believe, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase," 1 Cor. iii, 5–7.

The CHURCH OF GOD is the *temple*, the *house of God*:—

This church is to be considered as *universal* or *particular:* the church *universal* includes all upon earth who are united to Christ by living faith; and all who are united to Christ by living faith belong to this church. It *includes all particular churches* that hold the faith of Christ.

Thus spake the English reformers in their definition of the holy catholic or universal church:—"It comprehends *all assemblies* of men over the whole world that receive the faith of Christ: who ought to hold a UNITY of LOVE and BROTHERLY AGREEMENT together, by which they become members of the CATHOLIC church."* A *particular* church is a church distinguished *outwardly* by some peculiar views in doctrine or modes of worship, government, or discipline, from other churches. Each particular church has equal rights and privileges with any other church. None have a right to interfere with the just liberties of other churches. Civil or national establishments may

* Burnet's History of the Reformation, book iii, anno 1540.

have peculiar *emoluments*, but they can have no *divine authority* to restrain the peaceable exercise of spiritual duties in other churches. When they do, they become ANTICHRISTIAN.

CHURCH GOVERNMENT:—

By this is meant the system of ecclesiastical arrangement and discipline of some particular church. This church government must be distinguished into what is *general*, and what is *particular*: the *principle*, and the *application* in *detail* of that principle. The New Testament lays down GENERAL *principles*, but gives NO PARTICULAR FORM of church government in *detail*. All church government is Scriptural that abides by the general principles of the New Testament, however it may vary in detail. All church government is unscriptural that violates any of the general principles laid down in Scripture, no matter what may be their form in detail. The following are general Scriptural principles:—

As to the *relations* between *ministers and people*:—ministers are to *feed* and *rule* the people according to the word of God: the people are to submit to such a ministry, to *honour* and *support* such ministers. This is clear from the following passages:—Matt. xxiv, 45: Luke x, 7: Acts xx, 28: 1 Cor. ix, 7–14: Gal. vi, 6–8: 1 Tim. iii, 4, 5: Heb. xiii, 17. Any *limitation* of this power in ministers, by the exercise of *lay* influence, is Scriptural, so long as it leaves the minister in possession of that authority by which he can regularly, when *needful*, exercise the power of governing, as well as of feeding, the flock. All beyond this is unscriptural. The people RULING the *minister*, is the SHEEP RULING the *shepherd!* It is absurd, as well as unscriptural. It will always lead to the corruption of the truth in a *man-pleasing* ministry. It is as inimical to holiness of life, as it is to truth of doctrine: *discipline* will be relaxed, the hedge of the Lord's vineyard will be broken down, and the wild boar of the wilderness will spoil the vine. When ministers are, in themselves, or in their ministry and government, *clearly contrary* to the Scriptures, they lose their authority, and the obligation of the people to obey them ceases. See section iv of this Essay.

As to *ministers with ministers*: they are all, by divine right, equal. They are all to aim at edification, order,

and efficiency. *Gifts differ.* Some men have talents for government, some for evangelists, some for pastors. It is *consonant* to the GIFTS of the *Holy Ghost* that the church should arrange for each man to occupy that place for which he is most qualified, and which will most promote the order and edification of the church. Any such arrangement is warranted by the gifts of the Holy Ghost, by reasons of order and edification, and by the judgment of the greatest and best men of all ages. All these human arrangements must be subordinate to, and in accordance with, the great principle, that all ministers are, by divine right, equal. The moment they violate this principle, they become unscriptural. They set up human authority above the word of God—all other ministers are degraded—war is made upon the peace of the church—antichrist begins to reign.

As this is a point of so great importance, a little enlargement will be in strict accordance with the design of this Essay:—

SCRIPTURAL EPISCOPACY is, strictly, the feeding and governing of the flock; and has nothing to do with governing ministers. Every true minister is a Scriptural bishop. See section v.

SCRIPTURAL CHURCH POLITY, as appears by the gifts of the Holy Ghost, by the example of the apostles, by the duty of doing all to edification, *allows* of, and countenances, such prudential arrangements among the ministers, as that some should have *more eminently* the office of governing in the church, presiding in the councils of ministers, &c.; and that others should more particularly labour as evangelists, as pastors, as doctors or teachers: others as apostles or missionaries. This arrangement must never interfere with the principle that the act of every TRUE MINISTER in preaching, baptizing, administering the Lord's supper, and ordaining to the ministry, or governing the church is, by divine right, equal to that of any other minister. A superintendency thus restricted and guarded is not antiscriptural: it violates no law laid down there: it is recommended by the distribution of the gifts of the Holy Ghost: no ecclesiastical tyranny can be exercised by it: it promotes order, union, strength, and the edification of the whole. Call it *episcopacy*, if you please: the name is not

very important, only define the thing. I think the term episcopacy is not to be commended, because by *episcopus*, or *bishop*, the Scriptures NEVER mean a *superintendent of ministers*, but *only* of the *flock;* and because the *use* of the word in ecclesiastical writers has become *ambiguous;* and will, therefore, always leave room for *cavilling*, and pretences to ecclesiastical tyranny. It is against the strictest rules of right reason *designedly* to put an *ambiguous* word into a *definition:* the man that does it is a promoter of confusion, and not of peace.

EPISCOPACY in the CHURCH of ENGLAND, viewed as the reformers viewed it, was, in other words, a SUPERINTENDENCY of no more than *human* authority, designed for the order, edification, and good government of the church, established on the principle that all ministers, by divine right, are equal. All her ministers, who are qualified by piety, talents and divine knowledge; by the special gifts of the Holy Ghost moving them to the work of the ministry; and who are solemnly set apart to it according to the usages of that church, are true ministers of Christ. But every wicked man, in this or in any other church, every unconverted man, however set apart, is a wolf, is a hireling, a thief and a robber in the church. Let him repent, and give himself to God. Then, if he finds himself qualified by piety, and gifts, and moved by the Holy Ghost, and if the church be willing still to receive him, he will be a true minister. But the attempts to claim authority for bishops, as an order by divine right, on the high Church succession scheme, either in that church, or out of that church, is to declare war against the *divine right* of all *true ministers*, and against the *peace* and *security* of every Christian church. The advocates of these claims are the SCHISMATICS, or causers of division. They should be marked and shunned by every friend to the peace of the church. The man who aids them, or who wishes them God speed, becomes a partaker of their sin, and an enemy to the peace of the church.

Antichrist came into the church by an UNGUARDED use of ministerial superintendency. "The common appellation of bishops," says Beza, "was that of minister, until for the sake of government, one minister was placed *over* the others, and began to be distinguished by the name of

bishop. Justin Martyr calls him the president. It was from this that the devil began to place the first foundation of tyranny in the church, bringing in the notion that the WHOLE GOVERNMENT of the church was, together with the name, given into the hands of ONE PERSON. The scheme went on from the *bishop* [of a diocess] to the metropolitan [of a province]—from metropolitans to patriarchs." Lastly, the pope claims to be UNIVERSAL BISHOP, the lord over the whole church, and to sit as God in the temple of God! This is the very character and image of antichrist. "Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he *as God sitteth* in the *temple of God*, showing himself that he is God," 2 Thess. ii, 3, 4.

All attempts to make ministers LORDS over God's heritage is treason to the peace of the church, and leads to antichrist. Episcopacy, by divine right, is such an attempt. It is antiscriptural, intolerant, and antichristian. It sets up, as we have before said, ANGLICAN POPERY with many heads, in the place of ROMAN POPERY with one head. Both have the same mind, the mind of the beast; and both make war on the church of God. Both also spread out this spiritual tyranny through the *whole priesthood*, by pretences to a peculiar *priestly power* to effect wonders merely by their official acts. They can change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ: they can absolve sinners by their ministerial authority: they can seal saints, &c., though as wicked as Satan themselves. They have the *keys* of heaven and hell. They can depose kings, can *curse* or *give away* kingdoms. They can be very *Proteuses*, can become GODS or DEVILS as they choose. These things are literally true, as to Roman popery. As to Anglican Popery, we can only judge the child by its parent. As a child, it has had its deeds of darkness and horror, its *five mile acts, conventicle acts, Bartholomew days, &c.* Heaven forbid its maturity!

All the other protestant churches in Europe, with some trifling exceptions, have laid aside the episcopal mode of church government: they are governed by presbyters. Presbyters ordain, and perform all the offices and duties of

the Christian ministry. These presbyters are all Scriptural bishops, each having immediate oversight over the flock. In some churches, as in the Lutheran and the Wesleyan churches, a superintendency of one minister over other ministers, as well as over the people, is established. This is a mere prudential arrangement, and not of divine right. The model of all these churches is *more Scriptural* and *apostolical* than the episcopal form: the model of the episcopal government arose only from *ecclesiastical* authority. Episcopacy, by *divine right*, has neither the authority of *Scripture*, nor Christian *antiquity*: it is a USURPATION of modern times. It is simply an attempt to establish a POPEDOM OF BISHOPS, instead of HIS HOLINESS of ROME.

CHURCH AND STATE:—

The *state* is a *civil* government: the *church* is a *spiritual* government. *Kings* and *magistrates* are the *heads* of the *state*: *ministers* of the gospel are, under Christ, the *heads* of the *church*. The *jurisdiction* of the *state* is *only a civil* jurisdiction: the jurisdiction of the *church* is *only spiritual*. The *end* of the *state* government is the *peace and order* of the state, with the *security* of the rights of persons and property to every member or subject of the state: the *end* of *church* government is the *peace, order, and purity of the church*, the edification of its members, and the conversion of sinners to God. Such are the *nature, laws*, and *ends*, of the church and state, respectively.

But what is to be said about the *connection of church and state?* Every man, of course, has a right to form his own opinion; and, while he obeys all the civil laws of the state, is loyal to the king or queen, as *supreme civil magistrate*, and persecutes none for differing from him, no person has any right to hinder the peaceable expression of his opinion. The New Testament, I think, neither commands nor prohibits the matter. It is, therefore, in the *abstract*, not *unscriptural;* neither is it *necessary*. If it takes place, it must, to be countenanced by true Christianity, be under such LIMITATIONS as the nature, and laws, and end of each government, require. The state may supply pecuniary support to the church. This is plain from the nature of the thing. Any person may appropriate his money to the support of any thing that is *lawful*,

the state is a collection of persons, and may do the same. To promote the support of gospel ministers is *lawful;* therefore the state may support gospel ministers. But then the state cannot, *by divine authority*, make laws for church government, *simply as such;* because its power is ONLY civil: these laws are ONLY spiritual. For the same reason, the state cannot, *by divine authority*, either elect or appoint the ministers of the church, *simply as gospel ministers*, nor depose the same, any more than the church can appoint ministers of state, and depose the same. The *pope* has as much right to depose *kings*, as kings have to depose gospel ministers. The confounding of these things was the cause of the horrible wars between the popes and the German emperors. Opposition to any civil government, in the exercise of its own proper authority, under any pretence of religion, is ungodliness and rebellion; and the civil sword ought to punish and repress it. There can be no peace to either church or state, but by each keeping distinctly within its own sphere. The state has a right to demand obedience to the civil laws, and loyalty to the king and constitution, from every subject of the realm. Protestantism teaches loyalty to all kings: Popery denies allegiance to all Protestant sovereigns, by the fourth Lateran council. No pretences about the good of the church should be suffered for one moment to interfere with this point. Where there is not true allegiance to the civil magistrate, there is no true claim to civil rights or privileges. But then, this allegiance being secured, with obedience to all the civil laws of the state, the *authority* of the state extends NO FURTHER. Every man, as a peaceful and loyal subject, has a right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. And every society of men, while obedient to the civil laws, and loyal to the state, have a right, so far as the state is concerned, to form regulations for their own worship and church discipline. *If they choose to give up this right to the state*, in whole or in part, then, *so far as such a society is concerned*, the state has a right to exercise it. But the good of both will be best secured by keeping them perfectly distinct. The state may give its support to any peculiar form of faith; but it has no divine right to inter-

fere, by force, with any other forms of faith or worship, so long as the individuals following those forms are LOYAL SUBJECTS to the civil government, and to the king as supreme civil magistrate; *otherwise* the *state* might *lawfully* establish *heathenism*, or *Mohammedanism*, and PERSECUTE CHRISTIANITY. Any particular section of the church may accept of this support from a civil government, so long as it is done consistently with the nature, laws, and end of that church, and of all other Christian churches. As to its own interests,—it should make its own spiritual or purely ecclesiastical laws: elect and appoint its own ministers, as ministers of the gospel; and administer spiritual discipline over its own members. To bring in the *secular arm* in any of these cases, is unchristian: it will also inevitably secularize and corrupt the church. A STATE CHURCH has no AUTHORITY OVER OTHER CHURCHES, because of its pecuniary support from the state. The state can give it none. The state has no *authority* but *civil* authority. *Civil* authority has no *jurisdiction* over the conduct of individuals, except as *civil* members of the state. In fact, any particular STATE CHURCH is rather *under obligation* to the members of all other particular churches *for their part in the support of that church*. The members of any particular church have a civil right to object in an orderly, constitutional, and peaceable manner, to the *state support* of another particular church. If the *state church* becomes PROUD and PERSECUTING, BECAUSE of its STATE SUPPORT, then it would seem, that a serious Christian would be bound to withhold his influence from its support. If he thinks he ought to do more, he is justified, so that he does it peaceably, orderly, and constitutionally. If he thinks otherwise, he ought to act as a conscientious man. Let no man condemn him.

Such are the principles taught in the word of God: such also are the principles advocated in this Essay; and such are their consequences. The church of the living God is a spiritual church: all true believers everywhere constitute this church. They are "ONE BODY, there is *one Spirit, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above and through all, and in all.*" The MINISTERS of this church are all *brethren*. We are to call no man master

upon earth, for one is our Master in heaven, the Lord Jesus Christ. "Jesus said unto the apostles, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise DOMINION over them, and they that are *great* exercise authority upon them," that is act as LORDS OVER THEM; "but it shall NOT be so among you; but whosoever will be *great* among you, let him be your *minister*." Matt. xx, 25, 26. "But unto every one of us is given *grace* according to the measure of Christ. Wherefore, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men; and he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the UNITY of the FAITH, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Ephesians iv, 7–13.

Fellow Protestants, of every denomination, the writer would address you all as brethren. If he knows his own heart, he writes to promote UNITY AMONG PROTESTANTS, as brethren. But this unity can only be established by putting aside all principles that *exclude and persecute* such as hold the HOLY SCRIPTURES as the only and sufficient rule of FAITH and PRACTICE: such as, on the faith of the Scriptures, embrace the doctrine of the trinity: the perfection and sufficiency of the atonement of Christ: the divinity and sanctifying operations of the Holy Ghost: justification by faith alone in that atonement: sanctification through the operation of the Holy Ghost and living faith; and Scriptural holiness as the fruits of this faith, and as the way to heaven. Wherever these are, uncorrupted by any paramount errors, Christ is there: the church of God is there. The form of worship may differ; but there is "the way, the truth, and the life." Christianity does not depend on forms of church government, but on the truth as it is in Jesus. On this rock Christ builds his church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

Will you, on these principles,—the principles of the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible,—will you on these principles, give me, give every one that receives them, the right hand of fellowship? I trust you

will. I most cordially do it to every one, whatever may be the denomination he may have among men, who thus receives the truth as it is in Jesus. To me, there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, as to such, for we have all been baptized into one body, and have been all made to drink into one spirit. We are one and the same church—one and the same body of Christ. The little differences of doctrine, or modes of worship, that are found among such, do not affect the *essentials* of our Christianity. GENUINE PROTESTANTISM IS ONE: one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all: one Mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ. In this view of Protestantism as one, one body, the address of the apostle is beautiful—may the Holy Spirit write it on the heart of every Protestant!—"For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body, is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body, is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now are they many members, yet but one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary; and those members of the body which we think to be less honourable, upon these we bestow more abundant honour; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness. For our comely parts have no need; but God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honour to that part which lacked; that there should be NO SCHISM IN THE BODY; but that the members should have the same care, one for another.

And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it." 1 Cor. xii, 12–26.

POPERY, brethren, according to all the venerable reformers, whether in the valleys of the Alps, in Switzerland, in Bohemia, in Germany, in France, or in Britain,—POPERY IS ANTICHRIST. It is an awful corruption of Christianity. It is spiritual whoredom: the church forsaking her covenant with God, and playing the harlot with other gods and other lords. "So he carried me away in the Spirit into the wilderness; and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication; and upon her forehead was a name written, *Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.* And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus; and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration." Rev. xvii, 3–6. The Church of Rome has been drunk with the blood of the saints, and with the *blood of the martyrs of Jesus.*

POPERY *is* UNCHANGEABLE. *Popery is sworn hostility to Protestantism.* Every Papist is taught this as an article of his creed. All out of the Church of Rome she holds as HERETICS: *Protestants she holds as heretics. She curses* them with the *most dreadful curses.* Every Papist solemnly says in his creed, "I DO, *in* LIKE MANNER, CONDEMN, REJECT, and CURSE THEM." And he concludes: "*This true Catholic faith out of which no one can be saved*, which I do now, of my own accord, profess and truly do hold, the same I will take care to retain *whole* and *inviolate* most constantly, so far as I am able, unto the latest breath of my life; and, *by the assistance of God, I will take care* that those who are subject to me, or whose *care* in the place I am in shall belong to me, *shall* HOLD, *teach*, and preach the same also."

"*I, the same N., do promise, vow, and swear this. So may God, and these holy Gospels of God, help me!*"

Popery makes no difference in her denunciations against heretics, as in the Establishment, or as of other denominations. She curses that Church and the KING or the QUEEN, as *fiercely* as she curses the meanest subject of the realm. The pope thus cursed Queen Elizabeth as a heretic: "Moreover we do declare her to be DEPRIVED of her PRETENDED TITLE to the kingdom, and of *all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever.* And ALSO the *nobility, subjects,* and *people* of the said kingdom, and all others which have in any sort sworn unto her, to be for ever ABSOLVED *from* any such *oath,* and *all manner of duty,* of dominion, ALLEGIANCE, and *obedience;* as we also do by the authority of these presents, absolve them, and do deprive the same Elizabeth of her *pretended* TITLE to the *kingdom,* and all other things aforesaid; and we do *command* and interdict all and every the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they presume NOT *to* OBEY HER, or her ministers, *mandates,* and LAWS; and those who shall do the contrary, we bind in the same sentence TO BE ACCURSED.

"Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord 1570."—*Bull of Pope Pius V.*

This bull is given in "PERPETUAL MEMORIAL of the matter—that the *bishop of Rome,* as Peter's successor, has ALONE been made *Prince over all people,* and ALL KINGDOMS, to PLUCK UP, DESTROY, SCATTER, CONSUME, *plant and build,* that he may retain the faithful that are knit together with the bond of charity, in the unity of the Spirit, and present them spotless and unblamable to their Saviour."

These things show what POPERY IS, and what *Protestants* have TO EXPECT FROM POPERY.

What then, is the wisdom of Protestants? The watchword of the enemy is, "*Divide and conquer.*" Let the motto of Protestants be, "THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT IN THE BOND OF PEACE." Let no Protestants set up *exclusive, intolerant* schemes against their fellow Protestants. He that does so is an enemy to Protestantism, and a friend to Popery. This Essay has been written to expose, refute, and put away a scheme of this kind, already sufficiently characterized. The author requests the co-operation of

every true Protestant in this design. If there are any defects in the Essay, (and the author is far from considering it faultless,) let them be pointed out and corrected. If any can do better, he wishes them success. May the great Head of the church pour the Spirit out upon ALL PIOUS MINISTERS, and upon ALL THEIR CONGREGATIONS: may he send faithful shepherds to his flock everywhere; and may the kingdom of our God speedily come, and all the ends of the earth see his salvation! Amen!

A CRITIQUE

ON THE

HON. AND REV. MR. PERCEVAL'S APOLOGY

FOR THE

DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

On Saturday, Sept. 21, 1839, the following announcement appeared in the *Leeds Intelligencer*:—"An Apology for the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession, with an Appendix on the English Orders, by the Honourable and Rev. A. P. Perceval, B. C. L., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. This work, as the preface states, has been written at the request of the Vicar of Leeds, and with the assistance of several prelates and divines of the Church of England. It is a complete answer to a pamphlet lately published by a Mr. Powell."

The *Leeds Intelligencer* is, in church matters, under the influence of Dr. Hook and his party. The above statement, therefore, seems to demand that the author of the Essay on Apostolical Succession should give his readers an account of this answer to his work. The writer of the notice of Mr. Perceval's Apology evidently felt himself in an awkward predicament. A Dissenting teacher, *a* Mr. Powell, had published something on apostolical succession, a subject dear as life to every high Church priest. Of course Dr. Hook, the vicar of Leeds, a spiritual descendant of Pope Vitalian, Alexander III., Innocent III., Innocent IV., Nicholas III., &c., &c., knew his superiority too well to deign any notice of "*a* pamphlet, by *a* Mr. Powell." However, the public deigned to notice it; and about two thousand copies were sold in little more than a twelvemonth. Many periodicals pronounced a high opinion on the work. Churchmen are convinced by it;

and Dissenters feel confirmed in the superiority of their own ministry.

Dr. Hook is not unconscious of these things. He, therefore, particularly requests his friend the Honourable and Reverend A. P. Perceval, brother chaplain to the queen, to prepare an antidote. This is undertaken: several prelates and divines assist in the work, and it is dedicated to the archbishop of Canterbury. "A pamphlet by *a* Mr. Powell" is greatly honoured by all this. However, this Mr. Powell is such a strange sort of creature that he feels no gratitude when no favour is intended; and what he does not feel, he despises to affect. Yet certainly this "complete answer" to his work shall be examined.

The apology of Mr. Perceval presents one difficulty, which, I hope, few Dissenting productions exhibit. The difficulty is this; Mr. Perceval generally answers his opponents by *assertions*, and not by proofs of their mistakes. But this is probably one of the advantages possessed by gentlemen of the succession, that they have *authority* to be believed without proofs; and Dissenters have not. We have learned from a *very old Dissenter* from these gentlemen, to "prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good."

Dr. Hook proclaimed that the spiritual descent of "every bishop, priest, and deacon, was *evident to every one* who chose to investigate it." Now what is so evident to every one, must be capable of easy demonstration; but Mr. Perceval, in answer to the objection in the Essay, that there is "no sufficient historic evidence of a perpetual succession of valid episcopal ordinations," says, "If nothing will satisfy men but actual demonstration," (sufficient historic evidence was the question,) "*I yield at once*," p. 79. This pamphlet has done something: the chosen champion of the succession scheme "*yields at once*" that there is no sufficient historic evidence to support it!

Still Mr. Perceval hugs the scheme, though he "yields at once" that it has no sufficient historic evidence to support it. He considers it to be "an *article* of this one *faith*, [of the Bible,] and to be the *authority* for that one *baptism*," of the Bible, p. 62; and justly concludes, that there is "a consequence springing from these premises *if* established: in respect, namely, of the *paramount and exclusive claim* upon the *obedience* of ALL Christians within the British

dioceses which belongs *to the* BISHOPS of those dioceses," pp. 237, 238. And he has the courage to denounce the orders of all the Protestant churches of "Germany, Denmark, France, Scotland, England, Ireland, and North America," (the Episcopal Church excepted in the latter,) "*pretended* orders," and their power of ordination, a *fancied* power of ordination," pp. 54, 55.

It is very amusing, too, to learn, that if Dissenting teachers dispute this, and tell such gentlemen as Mr. Perceval, that, to pronounce such a sentence of excommunication against all these churches, *without* the clearest, strongest Scriptural proof, is semi-popish, bigoted, and intolerant,—then, Mr. Perceval says, this is persecuting the Church of England. Hear him at p. 62: "It is," says he, "I believe chiefly, if not wholly, on account of the *exclusiveness* of the doctrine that we who maintain it are exposed to hatred and reviling; and if we may judge from the language of our revilers, shall have to endure *persecution*, if it shall be in their power to inflict it. If we would be *content* to teach episcopacy as *one among many* schemes equally true or equally doubtful, it should seem, from their latest writings, that we should *not be disturbed;* but because we teach it, as the Scriptures and the church have delivered it to us, *exclusively*, therefore the *world* hateth us. Just so, if the early Christians could have been contented to profess their religion, as one of the six hundred tolerated by *heathen* Rome, and had been liberal enough, according to the modern abuse of the term, to regard all religion as pretty much alike, they would have had no need to endure the *cross*, the *stake*, or the teeth of wild beasts; but because they taught their religion, as the Scriptures and the church had delivered it to them, exclusively, therefore the *world hated them.* While, therefore, the charge of exclusiveness is an argument in *our favour* against whom it is brought, seeing that we bear it in common with the primitive martyrs, it is an argument against those who bring it, seeing that they do so, in common with the very heathen." We have quoted the whole of this paragraph, for the purpose, among other things, of giving a specimen of Mr. Perceval's views, reasoning, and style. He is in a dreadful fright, it seems, lest "*the world*," the *heathenish* dissenters, should call the successionists to martyrdom! Good man!

We will relieve him, by assuring him that the only persecution he has to fear from us, is one or other of the following tortures: either, first, To prove that the Scriptures teach this exclusive doctrine: or, secondly, To withdraw his denunciations and excommunications of other Protestant churches; or, thirdly, If he will continue them *without Scriptural proofs to support them*, then that he be published to the world as a semi-papist, a bigot, a persecutor, and a disturber of the peace of God's church. So far are we from persecution, that he bears witness to the contrary, by saying, that, if high Churchmen would be content that their scheme should be allowed "as one among many," we should NOT *disturb them*. Then it seems we only want to live and let live. Is this persecution? But what shall be said of men who really and seriously maintain, that if they cannot *reign alone, and extinguish all* other churches, they are injured reviled, about to be martyrs, and given to the teeth of wild beasts!!

While noticing miscellaneous matters, it may not be improper to make a brief observation or two on a note at page 25, in which he charges me with "*denying* that the apostles had any sole jurisdiction;" and concludes it by observing that they who "*carp* at the authority of *bishops* presently proceed to carp at that of the *apostles*, and will probably not be deterred from carping at that of our Lord himself." Now as to what he calls "*denying* that the apostles had any sole jurisdiction," my language, even as quoted by himself, is this: "There is no *very clear* evidence." And again, "I *think* we find no declared authority *solely* belonging to them as apostles, to call any ministers to account, or to depose them." Is this "denying" the thing, by merely expressing *a thought dubiously?*—or, by saying, *if* there be any evidence, it is not "*very clear* evidence?" "One might have thought," says Mr. Perceval, "that the sentence concerning certain false teachers 'whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme,' 1 Tim. i, 20, had been proof sufficient of such authority, and of the exercise of it." What Mr. Perceval might have thought, and what *is very* "*clear* evidence," may be different things. Now let us examine a little the only parallel case mentioned in the New Testament, agreeing to the statement made in the Essay,

viz., in churches already planted, having ministers already appointed over them—the case is found in 1 Cor. v, 1–13. In this case, though the church had neglected its duty, yet the apostle does not proceed to excommunicate, even this *private* member, on his own *sole* authority. He directs a church court to be formed, or called together. Pool, in his Synopsis, quotes Estius thus describing the composition of this court: "The apostle directs the calling of a public assembly, that *all* understanding the greatness of the crime, might acknowledge the justice of the punishment. It does not follow, indeed, from this place, that the multitude have the power of excommunication, yet the multitude in some sense excommunicate, namely, by their approbation and suffrage in favour of the excommunication, and by avoiding the excommunicated person. The minister performed the act of excommunication by the direction of St. Paul." Thus, also, Calvin on the place: "It is to be observed that St. Paul, though an apostle, did not proceed *alone* to excommunicate according to his own views and feelings, but he consulted with the church, that the thing might be done by the authority of all." Bishop Fell on the place says, "The approbation and consent of the church was used in the *apostles' time* in ecclesiastical censures." Erasmus, also, considers the matter was to be done in "a public assembly." The language of the chapter is decisive in proof of this. Here, then, we see it is not "*very clear*," that the apostle did this by his sole authority: indeed, it is clear he did not. And if he did it not in the case of a *private member*, much less, we presume, did he do it in the case of a *minister*. There is one more passage which I leave for Mr. Perceval to make "very clear," as evidence that the apostle could at any time, on his *sole* authority, depose ministers: "I *would* they were cut off that trouble you," Gal. v, 12. If the apostle wished it, and could by his sole power do this, why were they *not* cut off? See Dr. Barrow on the Supremacy of the Pope, supp. 5, sec. ii, p. 187, 4to. edit. 1680.

Mr. Perceval's charitable supposition, that they "who carp at the authority of bishops, will probably not be deterred from carping at that of our Lord himself," shall be illustrated by that of another Oxford Tract advocate. In a work styled "The Oxford Tracts, the Public Press, and

the Evangelical Party," by G. P. (G. Perceval?) *de Sancta Trinitate*, the author says, "The evangelical party *in the Church* are only restrained from the accident of their position from the destructive power of Rationalistic and Socinian principles: the spirit is already there, only its full development is restrained." If such be their charity toward their brethren, what can a heathenish Dissenting teacher expect?

Having made these miscellaneous remarks on things for which it seemed probable we should find no more convenient place, we now proceed to a more regular examination of Mr. Perceval's Apology.

He begins by laying it down as a fundamental position, that none are to minister in holy things, "in the name of God, without *express* warrant and commission from him, or from those whom he has impowered to grant such commission," p. 3. This we fully concede. But when he says "nineteen-twentieths of the Christian world" hold this to be by "*episcopal succession*"—that "none who have *not* received episcopal ordination are lawful ministers of the church, or warranted to perform any acts in the name and with the *authority* of God," pp. 4 and 5, we deny it. Even Mr. Perceval shall disprove it. At pp. 7 and 8, he says, the power of presbyters to confer orders "equally with bishops" is both the "doctrine and practice of the Lutherans in Germany and Holland, the Presbyterians in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and North America; and the Wesleyan Methodists."

M. Perceval has the confidence to assert that the Church of England maintains his scheme, page 9; but he that reads the seventh section of the Essay will require something more than assertion on this subject.

His first chapter he entitles "Congregationalism," and professes to examine the Scriptural evidence alleged to support it.

He has amused himself with imputing to the Congregationalists certain Scriptural precedents as "*urged* in behalf of Congregationalism," page 11. I believe Mr. Perceval is conscious that the Congregationalists have more sense than to "urge" any such things as he mentions "in behalf" of their scheme. He himself intends the introduction of several of these instances as a *caricature* of Congrega-

tionalism. But what honesty is there in such a misrepresentation of facts? However, the instance of Jeroboam will find its best parallel in the conduct of Henry VIII. The case of the seven sons of Sceva (Acts xix,14) would rather belong to Mr. Perceval, as they were sons of "a chief of the priests." Probably, as being in the succession, they were mortified to see the heretic and schismatic Paul cast out devils, and supposed that surely they were the only divinely commissioned persons for such a work. He makes little out in the matter of Apollos; of Aquila and Priscilla. They were, indeed, all *lay* persons: Apollos was an eminent *lay* preacher of the gospel; and Aquila and Priscilla were *lay* "fellow-helpers" of the apostles. Such proceedings *now* would shock our high priests. On the case of the man mentioned Luke ix, 50, Mr. Perceval *assumes* that he who opposes the succession scheme, opposes Christ. An easy way of answering difficulties, *to beg the question!* But we have many gentlemen writers now-a-days: "dig they cannot; and to beg," or confess the poverty of their information, "they are ashamed."

His second chapter is on "Ecclesiastical authority for Congregationalism." It contains only *three lines and a half*. "From ecclesiastical antiquity," he says, "I am not aware that a single precedent is, or ever has been alleged in favour of the Independent or Congregational scheme." This only proves how little Mr. Perceval knows about the subjects on which he writes. There is abundant evidence that primitive churches consisted of only one congregation each. It was against the rule of all antiquity for one bishop to have the government of more than one church or congregation. And that these bishops and their churches were considered to be, by divine right, each in their government *independent* of all other bishops and churches in the earliest times, is too evident to need any proof. It is maintained by Dr. Barrow on the Supremacy of the Pope, that "the ancients did assert to each bishop a free, absolute, independent authority, subjected to none, directed by none, accountable to none on earth, in the administration of affairs properly concerning his church," Suppos. 5, sec. v, page 220, 4to. edit., 1680. Cyprian maintains it, as Dr. Barrow there shows; and see Vitringa de Syn. Vet., lib. 3, cap. 17, p. 857, &c.: Mosheim de Reb. ante

Constant., page 152, and Burnet's Reformation, vol. ii. anno. 1559.

Mr. Perceval entitles his third chapter "Presbyterianism." He first very properly takes up the Scriptural evidence, as this, and this alone, can decide the question. The first passage he selects is from Numbers xvi, as to "Korah and his company." This, indeed, is not original: most high Churchmen exult in this example as death to presbyterianism. It is an old saying, that a man may make "*more haste than good speed.*" The breathless haste with which such writers appear to run to this passage for weapons against presbyterianism, that is, every thing but high Churchism, may possibly be the reason of their blindness when they arrive at it. The rebellion of "Korah and his company" is analogous, say these gentlemen, "to the rebellion of presbyters against bishops."—Indeed! Now who were "Korah and his company?" Who?—Who? Yes, Mr. Perceval, were THEY *priests* or laymen? What does this mean—"Seek ye the priesthood also?" If they were *priests*, how could they *seek* the priesthood? Dathan and Abiram were Reubenites, and could not be priests. *They none of them were priests at all!* Fie! fie! ye queen's chaplains and Oxford Tract-men, to trifle thus with the public mind! But your violation of truth will return upon your own heads. The case is plain enough, it was the Levites and the people rebelling against the priests; and not the priests against the high priest.

Mr. Perceval has the same sort of egregious trifling about the false apostles mentioned 2 Cor. xi, 12; and about Diotrephes, page 23. He professes to bring these as *Scripture grounds* for presbyterianism. Of course he would insinuate that presbyterians *urge them as such.* However censurable this conduct may be in itself, yet possibly it may be excused in Mr. Perceval. He can believe things without evidence: why should he not go a step further in his opinion of presbyterians, as he calls them, and persuade himself that they are foolish enough to suppose that an argument from *false* apostles and the *ministers of Satan*, will be good grounds *for* presbyterian ministers being *true* apostles and ministers *of God!!* He just refers to the angels of the Apocalypse. He does not, however, need to prove that these angels were prototypes of high

Church bishops: his *authority* implying this is enough, and therefore he wisely spares all proof—proofs to some people are troublesome things.

At page 26, the subject of the names of bishops and presbyters being used in common, is introduced. He acknowledges they were so "at the *first*, but have *since* been, by common usage, appropriated to distinct offices." Very well. Are we then to correct our Lord and his apostles by common usage *since* those times? "But," says Mr. Perceval, "our Lord himself is sometimes designated as an apostle, 1 Pet. ii, 25: sometimes as a deacon, Rom. xv, 8. The apostles are not only designated by that title, Luke vi, 13, but their office is called a deaconship, Acts i, 18, 25, and a bishopric, Acts i, 20, and they themselves frequently styled presbyters, 1 Peter v, 1: 2 John 1: 3 John 1; and deacons, 1 Cor. iii, 5: 2 Cor. iii, 6; and vi, 7. Again, the pastors at Ephesus whom St. Paul addresses are called *indiscriminately* bishops and presbyters, Acts xx, 17 and 28, and the same *indiscriminate* use of terms is observable in St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy and in that to Titus." All this we grant is true; but then are deacons as INDISCRIMINATELY called Christ?—are deacons as *indiscriminately* called apostles as presbyters are indiscriminately called bishops, and as bishops are indiscriminately called presbyters? Mr. Perceval knows they are not. Then what solemn trifling is all this! The reader will see the subject further treated at pages 87–90 of the Essay. The names thus indiscriminately common between bishops and presbyters, inevitably proves that their powers were common, that they were one and the same office.

The following is the best piece of reasoning in the whole book, and therefore we will give it respectful attention. "But, say the Presbyterians, in St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, he sends salutation to the bishops and deacons, Phil. i, 3, with no allusion to any other officer, therefore there were only these two instituted by the apostles, and any thing beyond this is of human origin. Answer 1st. So do the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, uniformly designate the Jewish ministry as priests and Levites, with no allusion to any other office; and a man might as well argue, that therefore, at that time, there

was no superior office, no high priesthood among the Jews, as that there was no superior office, no chief episcopate, among the Christians when St. Paul wrote," pp. 27, 28. The reader is requested first to turn to pages 54, 55, 56, 73, 74, and 84 of the Essay. Besides what is said in the above pages, especially the two points: first, that in case of the pollution of the high priest, a common priest was appointed to officiate for him; and, second, that all the ordination he had was necessarily by common priests: we further remark, that the above argument is really a fallacy. The fallacy is found in putting *a part for the whole*. We do not build our argument upon any *one* passage of the New Testament, but upon the *whole:* we say that there is no proof in the *whole* of the New Testament, not that there are no more than two orders of ministers of the gospel; for, by the New Testament, deacons, *as such*, are not ministers of the gospel at all; but we say, there is no proof in the whole of the New Testament of more than *one standing* order of ministers of the gospel. To make the argument about the high priest, therefore, a just one, it must be assumed that there is no allusion in the *whole* of the Scriptures to any other office than that of priest in general. Let this be done, and we declare, that, supposing the premises just, the conclusion would inevitably follow, that, by divine right, there was no really and essentially distinct office of the high priest above that of the priests in general. There is, however, frequent mention of the high priest in other parts of the Scriptures, though not by Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.

What Mr. Perceval says about the prophets so uniformly neglecting, with very few exceptions, to make any mention of the high priest, as distinguished from the other priests, is well worth attention. The writer has no quarrel with episcopacy, simply as such, yet the following particulars are remarkable. None of the prophets excepting Zechariah, it seems, ever mention the high priests distinctly. How striking the difference between the sacred writers and episcopalian writers! In the word of God, we have a series of inspired writers, addressing both church and state by the authority of God for centuries, and yet they *never* mention the high priest, but only as included among the priests and Levites: while episcopalian writers,

addressing the church and state, seldom mention presbyters and deacons at all; but bishops—bishops—bishops! No episcopalian dare professedly claim a higher authority for bishops over presbyters than what they suppose the high priest had over the other priests; yet, in very deed, they claim *ten times* a higher authority. Where the prophets mention the high priest *once*, they mention bishops *a thousand* times. When the high priest was ceremonially incapable of duty, a common priest was considered capable of performing it for him: a thing impossible for a presbyter to do for a bishop, according to high Churchmen. The *consecration* of the high priest was *always* by *ordinary priests*, or by Moses, who was no priest according to the law; but *the consecration of a bishop by presbyters*, a thing which the *reformers maintained to be lawful by the word of God*, our high Churchmen consider as destroying Christianity itself! Mr. Perceval says their system is accused of Judaizing; but the reader will see, that, on these points, Judaism was mildness itself compared with such a system.

His observation about Timothy's being admitted by the apostles to their own order, page 29, is completely refuted in sec. iii, sub-sec. 4, of the Essay: we refer therefore to that place, and pass on.

Mr. Perceval tries to say something about the apostle Paul's address to the presbyters or bishops of the church of Ephesus, in Acts xx, 17, &c. His opinion is, that Timothy was with Paul at the time: that Paul "had *already* committed the superintendence of these very pastors to Timothy," and that having Timothy with him, Paul gave "this pastoral charge to the pastors at [of] Ephesus, because their chief pastor Timothy" was with him on his journey, page 39. All this is mere conjecture, and evidently contrary to the scope of the whole address. These presbyters are charged to take heed to the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made *them* overseers or bishops; but, according to Mr. Perceval, this charge ought to have been given to Timothy; and Paul should have taught these presbyters that Timothy was the bishop to whom the Holy Ghost had committed the government of the flock, and of themselves also; and that they should take heed to be obedient to his lordship Timothy. But other absurdities follow Mr. Perceval's interpretation. First, on

this scheme, here are the bishops of Ephesus: this the sacred penman settles beyond dispute. Secondly, here is Timothy, *a bishop of bishops*, a thing utterly repugnant to the first ages of the church; so Cyprian and eighty-six other bishops in council declare, "*Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se esse episcoporum constituat*—Neither does any one among us constitute himself *a bishop of bishops.*" They account it *tyranny* to attempt it. Thirdly, here is an apostle making *another grade* of ministers. Now high Churchmen contend only for *three* standing orders in the church, *including apostles as one*, and deacons as another. However, Mr. Perceval can multiply orders with a dash of his pen. Here, according to Mr. Perceval, would be, first, deacons: second, presbyters, except he fully grants, which he does not, that bishops and presbyters were one and the same office in the apostles' days: third, bishops: fourth, Timothy, a bishop of bishops; and fifth, apostles. Five standing orders of ministers of the gospel!

The Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy, as pleaded by presbyterians, next come under Mr. Perceval's examination. His first argument makes Timothy a bishop of bishops; the absurdities of which scheme have just been exhibited.

As to the presbyters who ordained Timothy, all he has to say is, that commentators of the fourth and following centuries say they were bishops. We say so too; because presbyters and bishops were then one and the same. But suppose they were bishops of a high Church stamp, and that high Church bishops are *their* successors: then it follows, that they are successors of Scripture bishops only, and not of the twelve apostles. But this conclusion his more initiated brethren would tremble to hear mentioned. However, Chrysostom, the principal commentator on whom he depends, says, on the very place, "the difference between the presbyter and the bishop is *almost* NOTHING." Admit the utmost, then, that they say, it will not do for Mr. Perceval's episcopacy. But we do not admit them as authority: we admit nothing as such but the SCRIPTURES; and the Scriptures clearly show that they who ordained Timothy were *presbyters*.

"Moreover," says Mr. Perceval, "in the Second Epistle,

St. Paul ascribes Timothy's ordination to his own act, 2 Tim. i, 6. The presbyterians [the author of the Essay he means] would respresent this last passage to relate to miraculous gifts; but as there is nothing in the context to warrant such a supposition, but the contrary, it cannot be urged," pp. 33, 34. The passage is, "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the laying on of my hands." Now an English reader will perhaps be surprised to hear it said, that there is *nothing* relating to miraculous *gifts* in a passage the pith of which is, "Stir up the *gift* of God that is in thee." His surprise will be increased when he learns that the word "gift" in this passage is the very word χαρισμα, which the sacred writers use for miraculous gifts, in 1 Cor. xii, 4, 9, 28, 30, 31. The phrase, the "gift of God," *never* means an *office* in the New Testament. The expression "*stir up*," is never applied to an *office*, and seems incapable of such an application. Stir up thy bishopship, thy presbytership, &c., would be strange phraseology. All these objections would also apply to the interpretation which would suppose the gift to mean not Timothy's office, but his ordination. The phrase, "the gift of God," never means ordination in the New Testament. To say, "Stir up thine ordination," is as absurd as to say, "Stir up thy bishopship." The passage, therefore, cannot mean, by the "gift of God," either Timothy's office, or his ordination. It evidently means *spiritual* gifts, gifts of the Holy Ghost. Accordingly, it immediately follows—"For God hath not given unto us the spirit of fear, but of *power*, δνναμεως, and of love, and of a sound mind." The phrase, the "Spirit of power—πνευμα δνναμεως," most properly means the "power" of miracles; as the word δνναμις, when referred to spiritual matters, mostly means miraculous power. Chrysostom thus interprets the phrase, "the gift of God," that is, says he, "the gift of the Holy Ghost which thou hast received, to qualify thee for superintending the church, for *working* MIRACLES, and for the whole service of the church." We have shown in the Essay, page 59, that the gift of working miracles was conferred by the laying on of the apostles' hands, as a *prerogative* of their apostleship. Now are we to suppose that these gifts were conferred in this manner on so many inferior individuals, (as the Scriptures show they were,)

and that so eminent an individual as Timothy should not be favoured with them? This would be strange. I still think, therefore, that the peculiar force of the passage principally refers to this *gift of God*. That all other rich endowments of the Spirit for the ministry would accompany it. We need no more doubt than that others, who had these miraculous gifts, were also favoured with rich endowments of the Spirit for the personal performance of every Christian duty. Understanding the passage in this manner, the exhortation has great beauty and force: "Stir up the gift of God that is in thee, by the laying on of my hands,"—I, as an apostle, having been honoured as the instrument in conferring upon thee this "gift of God," these gifts of the Spirit, presume I may use some authority in exhorting thee to exert them to the uttermost in governing the flock, in miraculous operations, and in the whole service of the church.

In his fourth chapter, Mr. Perceval proceeds to examine the arguments of presbyterianism from ecclesiastical antiquity.

He first properly notices the testimony of Clemens Romanus. In answer to the argument from the fact that Clemens only mentions two orders, (suppose we count deacons an order,) viz., bishops and deacons, or presbyters and deacons, he refers to what he has said about the prophets only speaking of priests and Levites, with no mention of the high priest; and we refer to the answer to what he has there said. But he finds it convenient to pass over the fact that Clement *expressly* says, that the sedition in the church was against the "*presbyters*," sec. 47; that they were "presbyters" who had "the RULE OVER them," sec. 54; that he speaks of "*presbyters*" as having finished THEIR *episcopacy*, sec. 44; and that in conclusion he exhorts the church to "be SUBJECT to their presbyters," sec. 57. *He never says half so much about bishops.*

Clemens, indeed, does occasionally use the word bishop, as synonymous with presbyter, for he *never* uses them together and distinctly; but all his authority and exhortation are applied to bring the church to submit to the government of the presbyters. All these points Mr. Perceval forgets. However, like a drowning man, he catches at a straw. He says, "The unsoundness of the presbyterian

inference," from Clemens in favour of presbyterianism, "is beyond redemption, when we find St. Clemens expressly ascribing *to divine appointment, obligatory in his time,* the *triple* order of the ministry. These are his words: 'It will behoove us, looking into the depths of divine knowledge, to do all things in order whatsoever *our Lord has commanded us to do.* He *has ordained, by his supreme will and authority,* both where and *by what persons* they [the sacred services and oblations] are to be performed. For the CHIEF PRIEST has his proper services; and to the PRIESTS their proper place is appointed; and to the LEVITES appertain their proper ministries; and the layman is confined within the bounds of what is commanded to laymen,'" page 38. Here he leaves the passage, as though it proved his point without a doubt. I was perfectly aware of the passage when I wrote the Essay, but thought it too *trifling* to occupy space and attention; except one wished for materials to make up a book. But Mr. Perceval should have gone on. Clemens proceeds: "Let every one of you therefore, brethren, bless God in his proper station, with a good conscience, and with all gravity, not exceeding the rule of his service that is appointed to him. *The daily* SACRIFICES are not offered everywhere; nor the *peace offerings*, nor the SACRIFICES appointed FOR SINS and TRANSGRESSIONS; but only at Jerusalem—they, therefore, who do any thing which is not agreeable to his will, are punished with death. Consider, brethren, that by *how much the better the knowledge* God has vouchsafed unto us, by so much the greater danger are we exposed to." Now Mr. Perceval considers, that, because Clemens says, the Lord appointed the Jews a high priest, priests and Levites, this proves that *we* are to have bishops, priests, and deacons. But Clemens also says, that the Jewish church had, *by divine appointment,* "*daily* SACRIFICES, *peace offerings, and sacrifices for* SINS *and trangressions.*" By his argument, therefore, WE must have "daily sacrifices, peace offerings, and *sacrifices* for *sins* and transgressions." It will not do to say, that *spiritually* we must; for, *spiritually,* ALL God's PEOPLE are a royal PRIESTHOOD, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. 1 Peter ii, 5, 9. Therefore *literally* and really, without a figure, on his principles, we must

have daily sacrifices, &c. This is absurd: his argument, therefore, proves nothing. The simple meaning of Clemens is, that Christians are to follow God's rule for themselves under the Christian dispensation, as the Jews were to follow God's rule for themselves under the Mosaical dispensation. What this rule for Christians is, he goes on to explain in the following sections; and clearly shows that God had appointed "presbyters to be over the church, to RULE it, and that the people were to be subject to the presbyters."

In the very Epistle to Evagrius in which Jerome explicitly declares bishops and presbyters to be the same, he mentions the chief priests, and Levites, and laymen, as Clemens does. Grotius says, "Clemens's statement about the high priest, Levites, and laymen, does not pertain to the Christian church, but to the temple at Jerusalem; whence he *infers*, that as all things were to be done in a certain order by the Jews, much more should all things be done with decency and order among Christians." Grotii Epistol., p. 347, fol. Amstel., 1687.

Mr. Perceval, p. 38, &c., tries his skill on the case of the church of Alexandria, where, Jerome testifies, the presbyters made the bishops for about two hundred years: see the Essay, pp. 134–137. Archbishop Usher and Stillingfleet both understood Jerome as there explained. Mr. Perceval says nothing on the subject of Jerome's statement that invalidates its testimony to the *equality*, by divine right of bishops and presbyters. However, he makes an unusual stir about Eutychius. There may be some skill in his proceeding. Jerome was an untractable fellow, bearing a blunt, stubborn testimony against Mr. Perceval's scheme; so he dismisses him as quickly as he can, since he can make nothing of him. Eutychius seemed a little more manageable: he lived in a darker age: his writings are incomparably less known and esteemed than Jerome's; so in this case it is easier to raise a dust about nothing. Now, in the first place, no stress was laid on Eutychius's authority in the Essay. It was only said that Stillingfleet had quoted him to prove the truth of Jerome's statement. The learned Selden had urged his authority for the same end. "But," says Mr. Perceval, "Abraham Echellensis has proved that Eutychius has been misunderstood." Now

what does the authority of Abraham Echellensis weigh against the authority of these profound scholars? "This Abraham Echellensis," says the biographer of Selden, was "a Maronite priest, in the pay of the Roman pontiff; and he employed so much personal abuse in an attempt to refute Selden, that he injured his own reputation more than that of him whom he attacked."* Mr. Perceval speaks of the apostolical canons as evidence against Jerome's statement about the presbyters of Alexandria making the bishop: *he forgets*, however, *to prove* that these canons *existed* at the time to which Jerome refers. There is no sufficient proof of the *existence* of *the* canon, to which he appeals, for the first three hundred years after Christ; nor perhaps for five hundred years after Christ; but this is no great difficulty with Mr. Perceval. He refers to the question of the ordination of Ischyras, but this was about one hundred years after the latest time of which Jerome speaks. Mr. Perceval says the council connected with the matter "denied the power" of a presbyter to ordain. When he offers proof of this, it will be time enough to examine it. We deny that the council made this declaration. It is not to be found in the place of Athanasius to which he refers. Councils pronounced ordinations null for "a bare contempt of ecclesiastical canons. This ordination was done out of the diocess, in which case ordinations are nulled by council," Arel., c. 13: see Stillingfleet's Irenicum, p. 381, &c. Presbyterians do not depend on the case of Ischyras to help their cause; and Mr. Perceval cannot prove it injures it.

The next authority for presbyterianism, which Mr. Perceval examines, is that of Columba and his fellows, in *Iona*, &c., as mentioned by Bede, and brought forward in the Essay, section xi. The purport of his first remark is, that as Bede mentions bishops *under* the authority of Columba, who was no bishop, but a presbyter, it would be want of sense to suppose there was "*no such thing*" as episcopacy among his followers, p. 45. So we think too; but we think it would equally display want of sense to suppose that that which might be called episcopacy among them, was at all like high Church episcopacy. As episcopacy, it seems to have greatly resembled Lutheran

* Memoirs of Selden, by W. G. Johnson, London, p. 288, 8vo. 1835.

episcopacy, where Luther, *the presbyter, ordained their first bishop*. It is doubtless convenient to Mr. Perceval to confound the different kinds of episcopacy: (1.) the Scriptural episcopacy, in which bishops and presbyters were the same: (2.) Lutheran superintendency or episcopacy: (3.) the episcopacy of the English reformers; and, (4.) high Church episcopacy. But such discourse confounds every thing, and settles nothing. He says, moreover, that "we know from a letter of Pope John, in Bede, that there were five bishops in Scotland at that time," p. 46. It seems Mr. Perceval does not know that Scotland then meant Ireland. He should read Archbishop Usher, to whom he there refers. He could not have made this mistake, if he had ever read that work of the archbishop's—*De Primodiis*.

"But," says he, "the superiority of the abbot of Iona over the bishops of his house, turns out to be of the same nature with that which the dean of Westminster exercises over the bishop of Gloucester, *one* of the *prebendaries* of that chapter; or which the dean of Exeter, as such, exercises over his own diocesan, AS TREASURER of that chapter," p. 47. Now, in the first place, Bede does not only say that all the bishops of "*his house*" were subject to the presbyter abbot; but that this house was the HEAD "of *all* the houses both in Britanie, and also in Ireland; and that to this presbyter abbot, ALWAYS, both the WHOLE countrey, *and also the bishops themselves*, ought, after a strange and *unaccustomed* order, to be subject." Dr. Stapleton's translation. But, let us examine these cases of the bishop of Gloucester being, as "prebendary of Westminster, subject to the chapter," &c. Is it "a strange and *unaccustomed*" thing for a PREBENDARY to be subject to the chapter of that cathedral to which his prebend belongs? and for a dean to have authority over the *treasurer*, "AS TREASURER," of the chapter of which the dean is the head? Would a historian sagely report that as a strange and *unaccustomed* thing, when every body knows that it is the *universal custom?* And it is a mere fallacy to say the bishop is subject, when they mean the prebendary, or the treasurer, "*as the treasurer*," is subject. Let the reader again peruse Bede's statement, and he will see that his meaning clearly is, that the bishops, *as bishops*, were

"always" subject to the presbyter abbot. That all these bishops had only presbyterian ordination is shown in the Essay, section xii.

The case of the Waldenses, as favouring presbyterianism, he yields up to our argument, so far as to grant that any other view does "not admit of a plain and easy refutation," p. 47. He says it is "certain they are *now* presbyterians." If they are now presbyterians, they always were so: all the evidence establishes this conclusion.

The only remaining matter worth attention in this chapter, is, his assertion, that Jerome "denies to presbyters the *power* of ordination:" easily asserted, but never to be proved: see the Essay, section vi.

The fifth chapter pretends to prove the presbyterian scheme "suicidal." The argument he uses is, that suppose presbyters, as bishops, *after* the apostles' times, ordained others to be ministers of the gospel, that is presbyters in the church, and did not commit to them the power of ordaining: then, these last had no *divine right* to ordain. This is an easy supposition with Mr. Perceval and his friends, viz., that *man* can *alter* God's institutions. It is the essence of Popery. We say, "What God hath joined together," no man, by human authority, "can put asunder;" but God hath joined the power of ordination with the office of a presbyter: no man, therefore, can by *human* authority put them asunder. Bishops or presbyters who ordain presbyters have no power to *withhold* an iota of divine right from the office. Presbyters, therefore, have still a *divine* right to ordain.

Here he finishes his *answer* to the arguments for what he pleases to denominate presbyterianism: that is, for all that is not high Church episcopacy. And this writer, who cannot distinguish priests from Levites and laymen, in the case of "Korah and his company:" who knows not the difference in argument between the *whole and a part:* who makes Timothy *a bishop of bishops*, and *five orders* of ministers of the gospel: who can quote apostolical canons as evidence at a time when he cannot prove they were in existence: whose suppositions make Bede incapable of writing common sense: who quotes works which he had never examined on the subject for which he quotes them, as Usher's *Primordia:* who never meets fairly one single

argument of the Essay:—this is the writer who, as Dr. Hook's CHOSEN CHAMPION, has given "*a complete answer*" to the "Essay on Apostolical Succession!"

Well, but having vanquished the presbyterians, Mr. Perceval's way is clear, he supposes, to display irresistible evidence for high Church episcopacy; and his first wonderful axiom is this—"I will commence," says he, "the episcopalian section by showing, that its UTTER FAILURE to make good its claim to a *divine* origin, will not avail to clear the presbyterians of guilt," p. 57. Well done, Mr. Perceval! It is wise for a person who is conscious of an "*utter failure*," to provide for the case. They say it requires as much generalship to conduct a good retreat, as it does to gain a victory. But then there is an old book which true Protestants hold as the only and sufficient rule of faith, which says, "Where there is no law, there is no transgression:" that "sin is not imputed where there is no law;" but Mr. Perceval can prove that where there is an "utter failure" to make good a divine law, yet there is guilt. And, what is the best of all, he says, "Mr. Powell, the latest writer on the other side, and John Calvin, both say the same. Mr. Powell, speaking of a passage of St. Ignatius, says, that it 'signifies that where a superintendent had been appointed for the sake of order, (by *human* authority, as a *human* arrangement, by *custom*, &c., these expressions occur in almost every page of the Essay,) 'that order ought to be kept;' and then adds, 'Very right: so say all churches where a superintendency has been established, though making no pretensions to divine right for it.'" Mr. Perceval quotes another passage from the Essay, which says, that "when ministers violate the law of their commission, their authority so far ceases, and the people are in that proportion free from obligation to obey them." "Whether, therefore," says Mr. Perceval, "the origin of episcopacy be divine or human, yet this is clear from the above: namely, that seeing the British churches were and are actually" (by *human* arrangement, says Mr. Powell) "governed by bishops, the presbyterians can no otherwise avoid the condemnation of HERESY—nor the testimony of Mr. Powell of open violation of the written law of God against those who break that established order, than by proving that the British bishops either are not

truly Christian bishops, or have violated the law of their commission; a totally different question from that under consideration." Marvellous reasoning! Mr. Powell says that the episcopacy of the English Church is a *human* arrangement, for the sake of order; therefore Mr. Perceval says, that he, Mr. Powell, proves that the violation of this human arrangment is the violation of the "written law of God." Again, Mr. Powell says, that the British bishops never had a *divine* commission for that established order —that it is established by nothing but the authority of the sovereign, and the ratification of the English parliament. Yet Mr. Perceval states, that Mr. Powell makes it clear that it is heresy not to submit to it! Mr. Powell is an extraordinary man to be able to prove that a thing is divine because it is human; and that heresy is the breach of human regulations!

Mr. Perceval then meets the objections of *uncharitableness*, *exclusiveness*, *&c.*, and finds out that these are *recommendations* of his system—proofs that it is divine!! see page 61 and 62. Then he comes to the objection of the Popery of this high Church scheme. He says this objection "is an old device of the Papists," p. 64, and tells a tale of "one Cummin, a friar, who contrived to be taken into the Puritans' pulpits," &c. "The pope," he says, "commended him, and gave him a reward of two thousand ducats for his good behaviour." The practices of Popery are bad enough, I have no doubt, for all this: still Mr. Perceval is unfortunate in his example. Dr. Wells objected this case of Cummins against the Dissenters above a hundred years ago. His talented and learned answerer, Mr. Pierce, referred him to Dr. Collins's Answer to Dr. Scott's Case of Forms of Prayer, for proof that "the whole story is such a notorious forgery, that no man can lay stress upon it, without exposing the reputation of his judgment or his honesty." Pierce's Remarks on Dr. Wells's Letters, p. 15, 12mo., London, 1710. And in Mr. Pierce's Vindication of the Dissenters, a masterly work, part ii, chap. i, he tells us, that "Dr. Wells only replied, that he did not before know of any such writing, and never attempted to vindicate those foolish forgeries." A good example for Mr. Perceval.

Mr. Perceval thinks, that because Christ has an eternal

priesthood in heaven, gospel ministers must be priests upon earth. When he shows the law for it, we shall believe it. But Mr. Perceval belongs to a party who are nearer to Popery than to Protestantism. He is consistent, therefore, in wishing to establish *a priesthood* upon earth, "daily *sacrifices*, offerings for sin," &c. He quotes our Lord's saying to his apostles and disciples about not being "called masters," as though we urged these sayings against "all claims on the part of the Christian ministry to authority and degree." Mr. Perceval is expert at answering objections which were never made. We never *urged* his sayings for any such purpose. He is right (p. 70) in saying "that the only way authorized by Christ to dignity and exaltation in his church, is, by discharging the offices of the ministry, and thus serving the people;" therefore it follows that episcopal consecrations, &c., are matters of ceremony, and not essential.

To the objection made in the Essay, that the high Church doctrine "was unknown to, or unnoticed by, our Protestant forefathers, [that is, the divines who in the sixteenth century opposed the Church of Rome,] and therefore we Protestants need not concern ourselves about it," pp, 71, 72; he properly replies, "The divines of the sixteenth century were neither the founders of the Christian church, nor the writers of the sacred Scriptures; and, therefore, neither the Scriptures nor the Church are to be tried by them but they and their doctrines are to be tried by the testimony of the Scriptures and by the voice of the Church." That the reformers' doctrine, and the doctrine of all uninspired teachers is to be tried by the Scriptures, and not the Scriptures by their doctrine, we glory to maintain, as the great distinguishing principle of Protestantism, in opposition to all Popery and semi-popery. But the reader must not suppose that Mr. Perceval and his party maintain it: they hate it with a perfect hatred. The "voice of the church,"—the voice of the church! Here is their hiding place and their glory. However, should the reader wish to know what is meant by "the voice of the church," he might as soon expect to know where infallibility resides in the Popish Church, as to know what these persons mean by "the voice of the church," and where he is to find it. The best illustration of the case,

that strikes me, is the reported conversation said to have taken place between two distinguished statesmen on the subject of orthodoxy and heterodoxy. "What is the difference between orthodoxy and heterodoxy?" said one to the other. "Orthodoxy," the reply was, "is *my* doxy, and heterodoxy is *your* doxy." Ask Mr. Perceval, or any Papist or semi-papist, what is "the voice of the church?" the answer would substantially be, "That is the voice of the church which *says as we say;* and all which the fathers say contrary to this, we explain away either as heresy, particular opinion, or not of faith." There is no more common sophism among such writers than this play upon the term church, always *assuming* that their particular *party* is the "catholic church." As to the authority of the fathers, Bishop Taylor himself says,—"It is not honest for either side to press the authority of the fathers, as a concluding argument in matters of dispute, unless themselves will be content to submit in all things to the testimony of an equal number of them, which I am certain neither side will do."* Bishop Jewel, an incomparably better authority, says,—"There is no way so easy to beguile the simple, as the name and countenance of the fathers."† "I see plainly," said the renowned Chillingworth, "and with mine own eyes, that there are *popes against popes, councils against councils, some fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age against the consent of fathers of another age, the church of one age against the church of another age.* Traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found: no tradition but only of Scripture can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved either to have been brought in in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in. *In a word, there is no sufficiency but of Scripture only,* for any considering man to build upon."‡ But these high Churchmen are pretty good imitators of their Popish brethren, who, above all things, love "*a packed jury.*" When any of the fathers will speak for them, or any thing like it, they parade them in the court as though the fathers

* Lib. Prophesying, sec. viii,
† Preface to his Reply to Harding.
‡ Chillingworth's Religion of Protestants, chap. vii, sec. lvi.

were infallible: they will even bring acknowledged forgeries into court as true witnesses; as Bellarmine and others have done with the *Decretal Epistles;* but if the fathers say a word against them, they kick them out of court as individual testimonies, private opinions, not of faith and the like. Mr. Perceval and his party smart incurably under the correction of the great English reformers. Dr. Hook, indeed, has the boldness to assert, that by the reformers the "episcopal succession was assumed as a *necessary* doctrine of the church of England;" and that "one of the falsehoods propagative in these modern days is, that the reformers did not hold the *divine right* of episcopacy:" see that queer thing, "A Call to Union on the Principles of the Reformation, a Visitation Sermon, by the Rev. W. F. Hook, D. D., price *3s. 6d.*" Appendix, pp. 140, 141. "The *principles* of the Church," says he, "as we have seen, form an *insurmountable barrier* between us and the Dissenters, and render *union* with those parties IMPOSSIBLE," p. 41. A glorious call to union! It is a call, indeed, to Churchmen to unite to *persecute* Dissenters; that is, all who presume to differ from these lordly priests. Did the reformers proclaim such sentiments to Calvin, to Peter Martyr, Bucer, John Knox, &c.? Let the reader carefully examine section seventh of the Essay, for a refutation of all such libels on the reformers.

Mr. Perceval comes to the objection that "there is no sufficient historic evidence of a personal succession of valid episcopal ordinations:" we have noticed his reply before—see the place. But after "yielding at once" that this is the case, he thinks that "if it be a *moral impossibility* that any man, who had not been duly consecrated, could be accounted a bishop of the Church of England at the *present* time, then the *onus* rests upon the objectors to say how that which is morally impossible *now*, could have been morally possible *at any other period*," p. 89. That is, what is morally impossible now, in *times of order*, is, according to Mr. Perceval, by the same rule, morally impossible in *times of confusion:* that what is morally impossible in the *light*, is, by the same rule, morally impossible in the *dark!* Fine reasoning! But facts are stubborn things. And though it is a mere subterfuge to pretend that the *onus* of proof lies upon us; yet, as these boasters

of the proof of their scheme being "evident to every one," were chary of their production of that evidence, we have done what our argument needed not, we have produced proofs from unexceptionable testimony against the validity of the episcopal consecrations through which these men trace their succession. Mr. Perceval has invalidated none of them: see sections x and xiii of the Essay. Indeed Mr. Perceval himself furnishes us with proofs of the same kind. He says, at p. 110 of the Appendix, that there are "*many* instances to be found in church history of persons consecrated to the *episcopate* from the *laity*." Now we shall be glad to see Mr. Perceval prove that these were "*duly* consecrated bishops." On his principles, *he never can*. On Scriptural principles, which admit that bishops and presbyters are one and the same office, there is no difficulty; but then this cannot help Mr. Perceval, as he rejects these principles. Mr. Perceval's "moral impossibility," therefore, is contradicted by plain *facts*, and, *on his own showing*, "*many* instances are to be found in church history of persons" NOT "*duly consecrated* to the episcopate." For "a bishop ordained *per saltum*," that is, "that never had the ordination of a presbyter, can neither *consecrate* and administer the *sacrament* of the Lord's body, nor ORDAINE a presbyter."* Historic evidence failing, and moral impossibility failing, we see something of the "*utter failure*" for which Mr. Perceval *ominously* provided.

He thinks, p. 82, that the *fact* of the *contradictions* of history about the succession of the first ministers of the Church of Rome is of no importance: it is enough, he supposes, that the church was then governed by bishops; but what *kind* of bishops? Irenæus addresses them by the title of "*presbyters:*" Clement, who is supposed to have been one of them, writing to the church of Corinth, knows nothing about any bishop but what was identical with, and more distinguished by, the title of "presbyter." That, in the second century, the chief presbyter acted as a superintendent by the consent and authority of the other presbyters, may be granted: nothing more can be proved. But what will this episcopacy do for Mr. Perceval and his party? Nothing!

* Dr. Field, "Of the Church," b. iii, chap. xxxix, p. 157, fol. ed., 1635.

As a "*forlorn hope*," he takes to the case of Judas, the traitor: the reader will find this case settled to Mr. Perceval's satisfaction at pages 265, 266, of the Essay.

Mr. Perceval, having cleared his system of the objections above noticed, as exhibited in this review, now comes to display the full glory of evidence for his scheme of episcopacy. In noticing congregationalism and presbyterianism, his method was to place what he represents as their *Scriptural* evidence *first;* and then, in the *second* place, the *ecclesiastical* evidence: in displaying the evidence for episcopacy, he reverses this order, and places *ecclesiastical* antiquity *first;* and then, in the *second* place, the evidence from the *Scriptures*. This, in Mr. Perceval, is consistent. Thus Papists and high Churchmen place the word of God *under* the authority, subject to the interpretation, of what they call the Church. However, after all, the reader who may not have the privilege of seeing Mr. Perceval's Apology, can hardly conceive what a meagre, miserable display, he makes of the evidence of ecclesiastical antiquity. A few trite passages from the fathers, Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, &c., are strung together, without hardly a single line to prove that they support his scheme. If it should be said that their evidence for his scheme is so clear as to need no explanation, we believe many of those who have candidly read the Essay, will not be of this opinion. A complete answer to that work from such men as Dr. Hook and his party, should by all means have answered this part of it. But no: Mr. Perceval is afraid of "*tiring his readers' patience*," p. 96. Very well: Mr. Perceval's kindness to his readers may pass, only he does not forget, that he has not answered the question.

In the conclusion of this chapter, after quoting what are called the apostolical canons—a number of canons or regulations collected nobody knows when, nor by whom—he says "the Nicene council universally treats of bishops, and bishops only, as having power to ordain." That the canons of the Nicene council speak only about bishops ordaining bishops, we grant; but if Mr. Perceval intends his reader to understand that that council gave any decision that presbyters had *not power* to ordain presbyters, or even bishops, he misleads his reader: that council

made no such decision. Perhaps the reader may recollect that the Epistle of this council to the church of Alexandria was quoted section vi, of the Essay. In this Epistle, the council speaks of certain clergymen who "should have power to ordain," &c. Some reasoning is there employed against Valesius to prove that these clergymen were presbyters—he supposing that they were bishops. That reasoning is established as correct by the express statement of Athanasius, Opp., vol. i, p. 732, B. C., edit. Paris, 1627. Here, then, this point of the power of presbyters to ordain is established by the council of Nice. They say that these presbyters were to have, that is *to continue to have*, power to ordain: which ordaining by presbyters, the Epistle states, was "according to the ecclesiastical law and sanction." So much for the council of Nice treating "of bishops *only* having *power* to ordain." The only difficulty in the passage is in the rendering of the word προχειριζομαι. It sometimes seems to mean to *propose for ordination*, or to elect: this I admit. But then it also means to *ordain;* and, what is important, it is indisputably used in the sense of *ordaining* in this epistle only a few lines before, as to the bishop of Alexandria. The two acts of ordaining and electing are several times spoken of in this Epistle in varied phraseology—εξουσιαν εχειν χειροθετειν, προχειριζεσθαι—εξουσιαν προχειριζεσθαι, ἡ υποβαλλειν ονοματα—εξουσιαν εχειν προχειριζεσθαι, και ονοματα επιλεγεσθαι. Here it will be noticed that ordination is always spoken of first; and invariably as the exercise of *authority*—εξουσιαν: the latter clause of the two referring to the proposing of names, or electing. This *authority* of ordaining, is, in two of these passages, accompanied by the word we have rendered to *ordain*. The application of it to ordaining by the bishop of Alexandria is indisputable. These presbyters, then, are said to have εξουσιαν προχειριζεσθαι, *authority* or power to ordain; and this "according to ecclesiastical law and sanction." Such seems to me to be the legitimate meaning of the place. However, I do not wish to be positive, as there is some ambiguity in the language of the Epistle. But I am positive that the council did *not* deny the *power* of presbyters to ordain: I think the above are strong reasons to believe that their Epistle *affirmed* it.

We now come to the Scriptural testimony for Mr. Perceval's scheme of episcopacy. But, alas! for Dr. Hook, Mr. Perceval, and their party! the Scriptures have so little to help their case, that this champion of their cause occupied very nearly as much of his work with Eutychius and Abraham Echellensis, as he does with the whole of the testimony of the Scripture in behalf of their system. But it is better to be silent when we have nothing to say. The Scriptural testimonies which he produces, are, the angels in the Apocalypse: the case of Timothy and Titus: the apostle's superintendence of the churches which they founded—which nobody ever denied:—the commission of our Lord to his apostles:—these are the principal, and almost the only instances, which he notices; but as he does not even attempt an answer to that part of the Essay which treats on these passages, we have a right to conclude that he felt it to be unanswerable. The *highest*, the *supreme evidence*, the evidence of the Holy Scriptures, against this high Church episcopacy, remains, therefore, in all its integrity and completeness. *This is the all-deciding point.*

Speaking of the exhortations to unity to be found in our Lord's discourses, Mr. Perceval says, p. 106, "Our opponents are ever fond of citing those passages in Tertullian, Jerome, and others, which affirm that episcopacy was *necessarily* instituted for the preservation of unity. But if unity be a necessary end in the church, and episcopacy the *necessary* means for attaining that end, then how can the inference be set aside, that the Lord of glory, who ordained the end, must himself likewise have ordained the means *necessary* for attaining that end?" This statement is incorrect: those passages in the Essay which speak about the *reasons* assigned by the fathers for the institution of episcopacy do *not* say that the fathers "affirmed that episcopacy was *necessarily* instituted for the promotion of unity;" but only that their *opinion* was that it was *designed* to promote this unity. But suppose they had affirmed this *necessity* for episcopacy as a means for the promotion of unity, still the argument is false: both the premises are false: the conclusion, therefore, must be false also. The argument in full is as follows:

What the fathers affirm is necessary as a means to the

unity of the church, Christ instituted as a necessary means to the unity of the church:

But the fathers affirm that episcopacy is a necessary means to the unity of the church: therefore,

Christ instituted episcopacy as a necessary means to the unity of the church.

In the first, or *major* proposition, Mr. Perceval *begs the question:* it is neither proved nor granted: it is false. The next step with this argument lands us in full-grown Popery. The authorities of that church say, that a universal bishop is *necessary* for the unity of the church: ergo, Christ instituted a universal bishop—the pope. The second, or *minor* proposition, is false also, in Mr. Perceval's sense: the fathers never expressed an opinion, nor affirmed either, that the *kind* of episcopacy for which Mr. Perceval, Dr. Hook, and their party, contend, was *necessary* for the unity of the church. This is sufficiently shown in the Essay. The premises failing, the conclusion falls to the ground.

Mr. Perceval concludes his Apology for Apostolical Succession with a long Appendix, employed in proving many things which nobody disputes. This no doubt was much the pleasantest part of the work to Mr. Perceval.

Here we conclude this Critique on Mr. Perceval's task, enjoined by his friend Dr. Hook. He has "*yielded*" up the cause of historical evidence: "*utterly fails*" to prove a *divine* origin of their system; and ineffectually attempts an answer to the proofs that ecclesiastical episcopacy is a *mere human* arrangement. Such is this complete answer to the Essay on Apostolical Succession, by this *chosen champion* of Dr. Hook! The reader is left to form his own judgment upon its completeness.

AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

A REVIEW OF DR. HOOK'S SERMON

ON "HEAR THE CHURCH."

PREACHED BEFORE THE QUEEN, AT THE CHAPEL ROYAL, IN ST. JAMES'S PALACE, JUNE 17, 1838.

DR. HOOK is the apostle and high priest of the high Church scheme of the present times. If assertions were proofs, his writings would contain convincing evidence of the authority of his mission. I doubt his assertions; and I controvert his scheme. His doctrine of the SUCCESSION has been sufficiently refuted in the preceding Essay: indeed, the arguments in the Essay do, in their consequence, demolish his whole high Church building.

But there is one topic upon which he evidently delights to dwell; for he *speaks and preaches it everywhere:* it is this—That the present Church of England was founded by the apostles, and has come down to the present day, with no greater difference, at any time, from that apostolic church, than the difference caused in the same man by having *his face washed or unwashed:* see page 13 of his sermon. *This is his favourite illustration.* Speaking of the Church of this country *before* the Reformation, when sworn to Popery, the pope acknowledged as its head by all its authorities, when governed by bishops who preached the doctrines, and were sworn to the government of Popery, when the Church itself was filled with idols and abominations; with perfect and full-grown Popery,—and comparing that Church with the Church *after* the Reformation, he says, "THE CHURCH REMAINED THE SAME AFTER IT WAS REFORMED AS IT WAS BEFORE, *just as a man remains the same man after he has washed his face as he was before,*" page 12. The conclusions he draws from this argument, are, that the CHURCH OF ENGLAND "maintains

those *peculiar doctrines* and that *peculiar discipline*, which have ALWAYS MARKED, and do still continue to mark, the *distinction* between the church of Christ, administered under the superintendence of chief pastors or bishops who have regularly succeeded to the apostles, from *those sects* of Christianity which exist under *self-appointed* teachers:—that this Church is the ONLY church of Christ in this kingdom:—that it possesses its *original endowments*, which were never, as ignorant persons foolishly suppose, taken from one church and given to another," page 12:—that her *bishops* have *regularly succeeded* to the *apostles;* and that her ministers are the ONLY *divinely commissioned* ministers in this kingdom: all other denominations are SECTARIANS, SCHISMATICS, and left to the UNCOVENANTED mercies of God. On this ground he has the intolerable arrogance thus to insult the Christian churches in general in America: "When the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA were English colonies, the ENGLISH CHURCH was there established: at the revolution, the state was destroyed.* Monarchy has there ceased to exist; but the Church, though depressed for a time, remained uninjured; so that there—among the American republicans—under the superintendence of no fewer than sixteen bishops, you will find her sacraments and ordinances administered, and all her ritual and liturgical services celebrated, with no less of piety, zeal, and solemnity, than here in England: *there you may see* THE CHURCH, LIKE AN OASIS IN THE DESERT, blessed by the dews of heaven, and shedding heavenly blessings around her, in a

* This attack upon the religious bodies of the United States he mixes up with a political philippic. The writer is no advocate for a republic: indeed, he leaves politics in general to others. Yet there is a sentiment, on the page adjoining the last quotation, which deserves remark. The doctor says, "*Were all connection between Church and state to cease, we may be sure the monarchy would be destroyed.*" This was telling the queen that *none are loyal to her, as the queen, except she pays them for it;* and the same to kings in general. Dr. Hook, and such as he, may speak from their own feelings, *as to what they would do for the queen* IF NOT PAID BY HER; but to affirm it of Christians in general, IS A VILE SLANDER, and is calculated to disaffect the mind of the queen toward all her Christian subjects who are not of the Establishment. All real Christians receive the Bible as the rule of their faith and practice. From the Bible they learn to "*submit to the powers that be,*" equally as much under a monarchy as under a republic. The Wesleyan Methodists, for

land where, because no religion is established, IF IT WERE NOT FOR HER, NOTHING but the EXTREMES of INFIDELITY or FANATICISM would prevail," pp. 7, 8.

The reader sees at once that this is the succession scheme a little modified. That scheme has been sufficiently refuted in the Essay. We intend in this review of the sermon, to expose the sophistry of *this modification*. Here, "THE CHURCH" is the topic:—"BISHOPS" were the former topic.

If Dr. Hook be the man he is said to be, it is hard to suppose that he is not conscious of the sophistry of his own argument; in which case he would be a public deceiver; if his reasoning powers be weak, he may possibly be entangled in his own net. Be these things as they may, his argument is a TISSUE of *sophistry*:—we shall endeavour to *untwist* it, and break its force of deceiving.

The GREAT FALLACY or delusion of the whole argument lies in using the expression "*the Church*," in DIFFERENT SENSES, in *different parts* of the argument: that is, as logicians would say, in CHANGING THE TERMS.

The way in which he manages this, is, by giving only A GENERAL and *imperfect definition* of the terms in the BEGINNING of his sermon; and then, introducing *particulars* into it *in the progress*, as is the most convenient for deception. So, at pages 5 and 8, he says, "Now *at* the very OUTSET, I must state that I refer to the Church, NOT *as* a mere *national establishment* of religion, but as the Church, *a religious community*, intrinsically independent of the state: that is to say, I am about to treat the Church, not

instance, yield not to the members of the Establishment in loyalty to the queen. But further—*Was the Christian church connected with the state for the* FIRST THREE HUNDRED YEARS? Did not the state then persecute the church everywhere? The Roman republic had ceased to be when the Christian church began to exist. The emperor was more absolute than the king of England. Now, DID THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANS RISE TO DESTROY THE THRONE? Hear Tertullian: "IN ALL OUR PRAYERS, we are ever mindful of all our *emperors and kings wheresoever we live*, beseeching God for every one of them without distinction, that he would bless them with length of days, and a quiet reign, a well-established family, a stout army, a faithful senate, an honest people, a peaceful world, and whatsoever else either prince or people can wish for." For Dr. Hook to go before the queen to propagate his libel upon all her Christian subjects, and upon Christianity in general, deserves the severest rebuke. Such a man can cast "firebrands, arrows, and death, and say, Am I not in sport?"

in its political, but simply and *solely in its religious character*. And so you may perceive what is meant, when we say, that we wish to speak of the church, not as an establishment, but as *the* Church, A RELIGIOUS SOCIETY, A PARTICULAR SOCIETY OF CHRISTIANS." Then, this "*particular society of Christians*" becomes "OUR *Church*"—"the Church of ENGLAND"—"THE Church;" and, at the last, *on* the LAST *page* this "*particular society of Christians*," becomes DISTINGUISHED from all other "religious societies" BY THESE SPECIFIC PROPERTIES, as "maintaining those PECULIAR DOCTRINES, and that PECULIAR DISCIPLINE, which have ALWAYS MARKED, and do still continue to mark, the DISTINCTION between the church of Christ, administered under the superintendence of chief pastors or BISHOPS who REGULARLY SUCCEEDED to the apostles, from THOSE SECTS of Christianity under *self-appointed teachers*." Well, thanks be to the doctor for giving us *at last*, a complete definition of the Church of England. This definition, as perfected by himself, is, "That the Church of England is a particular society of Christians distinguished from all other particular religious societies, by its peculiar doctrines, and its peculiar discipline." By discipline, he tells us, he means its church government, as *administered by its bishops:* their succession is another question, and has been fully treated in the Essay.

Now let us try his main position: "the *present Church* of England is the *old Catholic Church* of England, reformed, in the reigns of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, of certain superstitious errors: it is the same Church which came down from our British and Saxon ancestors. *The Church remained the same after it was reformed as it was before, just as a man remains the same man after he has washed his face as he was before*," pp. 11, 12.

Here, then, let us examine the matter. The Church *before* the Reformation was "*a* particular religious society;" and the Church *after* the Reformation was "*a* particular religious society." There is, then, this *general* agreement, that *each* was "*a* religious society." So a harlot* is *a*

* Some respectable persons have made a little objection to this illustration. The writer has duly weighed their observations, and thinks them groundless, for the following reasons: 1st. The authority of the word of God, and of all the great reformers, justifies and authorizes the

woman, and a virgin is *a* woman. There is this general agreement between them, that *each* is *a* woman. Now if we wish to know the difference that *distinguishes* the *harlot* from the *virgin*, we should be told that it would be the *peculiar* principles, manners, and conduct of each. If, then, we wish to know the difference that *distinguishes* the Church *before* the Reformation, from the Church *after* the Reformation, the answer would be, "The peculiar doctrines and the peculiar discipline of each Church." Each is *a* Church, that is, "*a* religious society;" as each of the above persons is *a* woman; but were those Churches THE SAME? This will be answered by another question—Are *a harlot* and *a virgin* the SAME? *Yes*, according to Dr. Hook, if the *harlot washes her face!*

Let us look at the *face* of the Church *before* the Reformation, and at the *face* of the Church *after* the Reformation:—at their peculiar doctrines, and their peculiar discipline.

1. PECULIAR DOCTRINES:

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.—The Church, *before* the Reformation, maintained the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, and committed *hundreds to the flames* for disputing it; but

The Church, *after* the Reformation, declares it "*repugnant* to the *plain words of Scripture*, that it *overthroweth the nature of a sacrament*, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." Art. 28th of the Church of England.

MASSES.—The Church, *before* the Reformation, maintained that the priests did OFFER CHRIST for the *quick and dead* to have *remission* of *pain and guilt*:—

The Church, *after* the Reformation, declares these positions to be "*blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.*" Article 31st of the Church of England.

IMAGES.—The Church, *before* the Reformation, maintained *the worship* of *images*, and the churches *were full of images*:—

The Church, *after* the Reformation, declares this to be IDOLATRY: see homily on idolatry. Thus also the 22d

application of the term harlot as the *most appropriate* designation of a *corrupt* church; so it is here applied to the Church of Rome. 2ndly. The contrast of the *purity* of the Church of England by the term virgin, pays a respect to that Church, as constituted by the reformers, and as a most important branch of the Protestant church, which, under this view, the writer has a pleasure in paying.

Article: "The Romish doctrine concerning *purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration,* as well of *images* as of *reliques,* and also *invocation of saints,* is *a fond thing, vainly invented,* and *grounded* upon *no* warranty of *Scripture,* but rather repugnant to the word of God."

JUSTIFICATION.—The Church, *before* the Reformation, maintained that a man was *justified* through the grace of God *by works,* and NOT *by faith* ONLY:—

The Church, *after* the Reformation, maintained that the doctrine "that we are *justified by faith* ONLY is *a most wholesome doctrine,* and *very full of comfort,* as more largely is expressed in the homily of justification." Article 11.

These points of doctrine may suffice—many more might be added.

2. PECULIAR DISCIPLINE:

The Church, *before* the Reformation, acknowledged *the* POPE AS SUPREME HEAD OF THE CHURCH, as CHRIST'S VICAR, and that all were heretics who rejected him. A few passages from the canon law, as collected by Archbishop Cranmer, and given in the Collection of Records by Bishop Burnet, in his History of the Reformation, book iii, No. 27, will illustrate this point:

"He that acknowledgeth *not* himself to be under the bishop of Rome, and that the *bishop of Rome* is ordained by God to have *primacy over all the world, is a heretic, and cannot be saved,* nor is not of the flock of Christ.

"All the *decrees of the bishop of Rome* ought to be kept perpetually of every man, without any repugnancy, *as God's word* spoken by the mouth of Peter, and *whosoever doth not receive them,* neither availeth them the Catholic faith, nor the four evangelists, but *they blaspheme the Holy Ghost, and shall have no forgiveness.*

"The see of Rome hath neither spot nor wrinkle in it, nor cannot err.

"The *bishop of Rome may excommunicate emperors and princes* and DEPOSE THEM from their states, and *assoil* their *subjects* from their *oath and obedience* to them, and *so constrain them to rebellion.*"

ALL the BISHOPS in England, *before* the Reformation, SWORE OBEDIENCE TO THE POPE OF ROME: see section xii of the Essay: but

The Church, *after* the Reformation, declared the *pope to*

be antichrist, the *son of perdition;* and the *Church of Rome* to be an *idolatrous* Church: see Essay, section xi. And *every bishop* of the Church of England is bound to REJECT THE AUTHORITY of the *pope* and the court of Rome, under the PENALTY of PRÆMUNIRE.

Thus we see that the "*peculiar doctrines* and the *peculiar discipline*" of the Church *before* the Reformation, and those of the Church *after* the Reformation, EXPRESSLY CONTRADICT EACH OTHER: the Church *after* the Reformation charging IDOLATRY and BLASPHEMY upon the Church *before* the Reformation. Yet, says Dr. Hook, "They are THE SAME." And Dr. Hook can prove it—yea more—he can prove, by his principles, that *black is white*, and that *two and two are five*. Thus *two* and *two* are numbers; and *five* is a number; ergo, *two* and *two* are the *same as five*, that is, they are both numbers:—black is *a* colour, and white is *a* colour; ergo, *black and white are the same*, that is, they are both colours. Yes, replies the reader, but *it was supposed* you meant that two and two were the *same in amount* as five; and that black was the *same colour* as white. True, but this is leaving the GENERAL *nature* of the things, and coming to the *specific differences;* and I only spoke in generals. Dr. Hook only shows you the *general* nature of the thing *at first:* the Church *before* the Reformation is *a* religious society, and the Church *after* the Reformation is *a* religious society: ergo, *they are the same*, that is *they are both religious societies;* as black and white are both colours. True, says the reader, *but we supposed he meant* that they had the *same distinguishing properties* or qualities. Whether Dr. Hook meant it himself or not, I cannot say; but he doubtless meant *his readers to think they had the same distinguishing properties*, that is, the same *peculiar* doctrines, and the same *peculiar* discipline: see p. 23 of his sermon as quoted above. However, it was neither convenient for him to say so "at the outset" of his sermon, nor was it agreeable to him to exhibit this their identity afterward: *black* would have been seen to be *black*, and *white* would have been *white* still: the virgin would have appeared a virgin, and the harlot would have appeared a harlot, after the doctor's perspiration *in washing her face.*

The doctor's position, then, is *a mere fallacy*, involving

the real absurdity, that two religious societies, *distinguished* as societies by their "*peculiar* doctrines, and their *peculiar* discipline," and whose *peculiar* doctrines and *peculiar* discipline flatly *contradict* each other, are yet one and the *same* society, that is, that CONTRADICTORY propositions are *identical* propositions!—They are,—just as much so as *black* and *white* are the *same*, and as two and two are five.

The absurdity of the doctor's position being thus manifest, all his conclusions fall to the ground; and the following opposite conclusions become established:

CONCLUSION 1st.—The Church *before* the Reformation, and the Church *after* the Reformation, are two *different* churches, distinguished by directly opposite peculiar doctrines, and peculiar discipline, or church government.

CONCLUSION 2d.—The Church *after* the Reformation, as distinguished by its peculiar doctrine and peculiar discipline, was *founded* at the Reformation, as much so as the Scotch church, the Lutheran church, or any of those other sects toward which the doctor manifests such scorn.

As to the succession of the bishops of the Church of England, through the Church of Rome, or through the Church *before* the Reformation, we have shown in the Essay, that they have no more claim, on that ground, than bastards have to the inheritance of legitimate children.

CONCLUSION 3d.—The Church of England, and the bishops of the Church of England, have no more just affinity to the British or Saxon churches, than any other church that equally resembles them in peculiar doctrine and discipline. The doctor's assertion, at page 9, that "the Church, as at the period of the Reformation, had existed, as all parties admit, from the first planting of Christianity in England," is one of his accustomed, hardy, fallacious, and baseless statements. Had that Church, as *distinguished* at the period of the Reformation by such "peculiar doctrines and peculiar discipline" as we have seen above, existed as *always marked* (p. 23) by those "peculiar doctrines and that peculiar discipline" from the first planting of Christianity in England? Yes! the doctor says, "All parties admit" this!! Then all parties admit that FULL-GROWN POPERY existed in England from the first planting of Christianity in this country!! The

reader who believes this is worthy to be a disciple of Dr. Hook.

Conclusion 4th.—The *right* of the present Church of England to those church *endowments*, which existed before the Reformation, is merely *statute* right. The parliament has as much power to alienate as to appropriate. If the Church of England has a righteous claim to those *endowments*, any other church might, by another statute, have an equally righteous claim to them.

The sum of the whole, is, then, that the Church of England, as a religious society, must establish its claim to affinity with apostolical churches, with the British and Saxon churches, and the Church *before* the Reformation, by the resemblance of its peculiar doctrines and its peculiar discipline to the peculiar doctrines and the peculiar discipline of those churches. Her bishops, and her other ministers, must prove their claim to apostolicity by their *likeness* to the *apostles* in personal piety, a divine call to the ministry, and by the preaching of the faith as the apostles preached it. Whatever they possess besides is but as the chaff to the wheat. All other churches must do the same. Here is the *divine rule*. Here let all strive to excel: let all covet the best gifts. Above all, let them keep in mind the *more excellent way*. What is true individually, is true of churches collectively; "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have *not charity*, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal," &c., 1 Cor xiii.

GENERAL INDEX.

Abbots, though only presbyters, ordain bishops, 159, note.
Aerius, 132.
African church never maintained episcopacy *jure divino*, 173.
Alasco, John, 196, &c.
American churches, Dr. Hook's attack upon, 345.
Ambrose, St., on bishops as apostles, 34, 49—on the primus presbyter, 100—his Commentaries, 130—on succession of faith, 288.
Ancyra, council of, on presbyters ordaining, 137.
Angels of the seven churches of Asia, 63–67, 145–147.
Apostle, different meanings of the word, 40, &c.—prerogatives of, 45, &c.—power of, 318.
Apostleship of bishops examined, 33–54.
Apostolical bishops, who? 53.
Arian bishops, ordination by, 261, 262.
Athanasius on episcopacy examined, 130.
Augsburg confession on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 181.
Augustine, bishop of Hippo, on the word apostle, 50—on the authority of fathers and councils, 93—on the office of a presbyter, 137.
Austin the monk, his treachery, 246.

Baptism nullified by confirmation, 201, 202.
Baronius on the election of the popes, 224, &c.
Barrow, Dr. Isaac, on the nature of proofs, 38—on the apostolical office, 53—his arguments destroy high Church episcopacy, 55—on forsaking bad and heretical ministers, 83—remarks on Cyprian, 124, 125.
Barrington, Lord, on Clemens Romanus, 102.
Bede, on British bishops, 242, &c.
Bellarmine on bishops having no part of true apostolical authority, 53.
Bentley, Dr., on bishops being successors of the apostles, 36.
Beveridge, Bishop, gives up Scriptural authority for any certain form of church government, 31—on the term high priest, 54.
Beza, on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 206—on episcopacy, 305.
Bickersteth, Rev. E., his *Christian Student* quoted, 281.
Bilney, the martyr, on the inward call to the ministry, 77.
Bingham's Origines Ecclesiasticæ quoted, 34—on the authority of Jerome, 99.
Bishop, ἐπισκοπος, meaning of, in the New Testament, 86–91.
Bishops, how successors of the apostles, 33–54—how they resemble the Jewish high priests, 54, 55—ancient British, account of, 241–246.
Bishopric, 90.
Blondel, David, on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 208.
Bochart, on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 208.
Bona, Cardinal, quoted, 94.
Burnet, Bishop, quoted, 150, 153, 158, 196—on the elections of the popes, 223—on the nature of the Christian ministry, 269, 270.

Cabassute quoted, 117, 124.

Calderwood's *Altare Damascenum* quoted, 136.
Calvin, on confirmation, 201—on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 206—on Popish ordinations, 267—letter to Archbishop Cranmer, 273—on apostolical succession, 288, 289.
Canon law quoted, 174.
Carthage, fourth council of, quoted, 123, 124.
Catholic Church, what? 302.
Cave, Dr., on the character of Epiphanius, 133.
Chairs, apostolical, presbyters sit in, 117.
Chairs, bishops', what? 117, 121.
Charity of Papists and high Churchmen, 26, 27.
Chemnitius on the atrocity of the succession scheme, 23.
Chillingworth, on *divine right*, 29—a fine passage from, 296.
Church government, 36, 303.
Church of England, as by the reformers, 15, 148–173, 305, 344.
Church and state, 148, 307–309, 345, note.
Chrysostom, on ordination, explained, 133–136.
Chor-episcopi, or village bishops, 137, 138.
Claude, on the absurdity of the high Church scheme, 24—on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 208.
Clemens Alexandrinus on episcopacy, examined, 118, &c.
Clemens Romanus's Epistle commented upon, 101, &c., 328, 329.
Clergy, English, general exclusiveness of, 15.
Collega, term explained, 123, 124.
Columba, the abbot of the monastery of Iona, &c., governs bishops, 242–245, 332.
Comenius quoted, 184.
Comber, Dr., on the baselessness of succession, 221, &c.
Commission of Christ to the apostles, explained, 31, 32.
Confession of Augsburg on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 181.
Confirmation examined, 200–204.
Congregationalism, 320.
Cox, Dr., the reformer, on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 154.
Cosin, Bishop, on presbyterian ordination, 52, 158.
Courayer, Dr., on English ordinations, quoted, 141, 142.
Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, on episcopal consecration, 141, 142—on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 154, 206,
Cummin, the friar, 335.
Cyprian, on episcopacy, examined, 122, &c.—on genuine succession, 286.

Daille, the celebrated French Protestant divine, exposes the plea of Timothy's being bishop of Ephesus, 62—on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 208.
Damian, P., cardinal-bishop of Ostia, quoted, 258.
Dodwell, the Rev. H., on unity with bishops as necessary to salvation, 21—gives up Scriptural evidence for any particular form of church government, 30, 36—on the office of an apostle, 37—on Judas, 37—his arguments establish a popedom, 124.

Edward VI. (King) on the high priesthood, 56.
Elections of popes described, 224.
Elfric, Saxon archbishop of Canterbury, canons of, 96.
England, king of, the vassal of the pope, 249.
English bishops before the Reformation, ordination and descent of, 247, &c.
Enthronization of bishops, 141.
Epaphroditus, a messenger of the church, his office explained, 44.
Epiphanius's character, &c., 132.
Episcopacy of the New Testament, what? 86–92.
Episcopacy, ecclesiastical, what? 99, &c., 145–148.
Episcopal consecration non-essential, 140–143.
Erasmus, on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 206.

Exclusiveness too general among the clergy of the Church of England, 15—of the high Church succession scheme, 26, and generally through the Essay.
Evangelist, what? 59.
Eusebius, on the word apostle, 49—on the darkness and difficulty of the succession, 219, 220.
Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria, quoted, 136, 330.

Faber's work on the Vallenses, quoted, 194—remark on, 194.
Faith, succession of, the only essential succession, 111—115, 285.
Fathers, authority of, 93, &c.
Field, Dr., on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 166–170—on genuine succession, 291.
Firmilian, bishop of Cesarea, on ordination by presbyters, 129.
Flacius Illyricus, M., on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 207.
French reformed church, maintains the identity of bishops and presbyters, 182—on confirmation, 201.
Froude, R. Hurrell, an Oxford Tract-man, hates the Reformation, 148—is disgusted with Bishop Jewel's Defence, 160.
Fulke, Dr., on the nullity of Popish ordination, 269.

"Gift of God," what? 327.
Gildas's account of the wickedness of the bishops in his days, 242.
Godwin, Bishop, on the Lives of the English Bishops, 247, &c.
Godwin, Dr., on the Jewish high priesthood, 55.
Gradin, Arvid, quoted, 185.
Greek church never maintained episcopacy *jure divino*, 174—on confirmation, 203.
Gregory Nazianzen, on genuine succession, 287.
Grindal, Abp. of Canterbury, approves of presbyterian ordination, 158.
Grosthead, bishop of Lincoln, reproves the pope, 248.
Grotius, on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 209—on divine right, 209.

Hall, Bishop, on presbyterian ordination and genuine succession, condemns this high Church scheme, 292.
Hammond, Dr., gives up direct Scripture evidence for episcopacy, 30—on Scriptural presbyters as governors of the church, 37—on the succession of the Jewish high priests, 276.
Hands, imposition of, 33, 142, 254.
Haweis, Dr., Church History of, giving an account of the rise of Methodism, 282.
Heber, Bp., remarks of, on Bp. Taylor's doctrine of confirmation, and on his use of authorities, 203.
Hickes, on the dignity of the episcopal order, 19.
High Churchism, semi-popery, exclusiveness and intolerance of, *passim*.
High priest, Jewish, 54, 55, 72, 84, 323, 324,
Hilary, the deacon, quoted, 130.
Hispala, council of, quoted, 176.
Historic evidence for high Church succession, none, 216, &c., 316.
Holland, Dr., the king's professor of divinity at Oxford, on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 172.
Holmes, Rev. J., of Fulneck, "History of the United Brethren," quoted, 186, &c.
Hook, Dr., vicar of Leeds, on high Church episcopacy and succession, 19—on episcopal ordination as essential to salvation, 22—arrogance of, 28—on bishops being apostles, 35—his blundering and bigoted scorn of the reformed churches, 217—his "Call to Union," 338—On Hear the Church, reviewed, 344.
Hooker, on presbyters, 66, 163, 165—on *divine right*, 68, 164, 165.

Ignatius's Epistles examined, 104.
Irenæus, on the identity of bishops

and presbyters, 109, &c.—on genuine succession, 286.

James, St., made bishop over the apostles!! 69.
Jerome, on the word apostle, 50—on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 97–99—on ordination by presbyters, 135, &c.
Jewel, Bishop, on the word presbyter, 109—hated by Froude, an Oxford Tract-man, 160—on non-preaching prelates, 280—on genuine succession, 290.
Joan, Pope, history of, 233, &c.
Johnson, Rev. Mr., translator of the Code of the Universal Church, quoted, 178—on the monk Austin and the British bishops, 246—on the bishop's pall, 253.
Judas, his apostleship treated, 265.
Jurisdiction of bishops, what? 170–172, 334, 335.
Justin Martyr's testimony to episcopacy, examined, 108, &c.

Korah and his company, high Church blunders upon, 322.

Lapsed, the case of, in Cyprian, explained, 126.
Laud, Abp., the father of semi-papist Church of England divines, and *jure divino* men, 14.
Lavington, on moral preaching, 281.
Leger, on the Waldenses, 194
Leslie, Rev. C., on episcopacy, 181.
Lloyd, bishop of Worcester, referred to, 245.
Luther ordains the first bishop of the Lutheran church, 180.
Lutheran episcopacy, 100.

Martyr, Peter, on Popish vestments, 274—on the succession of faith, 289.
Mason, Archdeacon, on the power of wicked bishops to give true orders, 21—on St. Austin's connection with the slaughter of one thousand two hundred presbyters, 246.
Melancthon, on confirmation, 200—on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 207—on genuine succession, 289.
Methodists, Wesleyan, rise of, 282, &c.—superintendency of, resembles primitive episcopacy, 66, 101, 108, 215, 307.
Ministers, gospel qualifications of, 75, &c., 256, &c., 300.
Ministers, wicked, to be forsaken, 79–83, 111, 125.
Moral impossibility, 338.
Moravian episcopacy, 184, &c.
Mornay, P. Lord du Plessis, 268.
Mosheim, on Ignatius's Epistles, 104—on the identity of bishops and presbyters, 212.

Names of bishops and presbyters so used *in common* in the New Testament as to prove that the things were substantially the same, 87–90, 323.
Nice, Council of, its Epistle quoted, 138–140, 341.

Order, degree, &c., explained, 95.
Orders, Book of, for ordaining Bishops and Priests by the reformers, explained, 155, &c.
Ordination, Popish, examined, 254–265.
Ordination of presbyters, form of, in the Church of England, 33, 155, 156.
Ordination by presbyters—see Presbyter.
Origen, writings of, on episcopacy, examined, 120, &c.
Overall, Bishop, quoted, 107.
Oxford Tracts, quoted, 22—writers of, English Jesuits, 179—their sophistical ambiguity exposed, 181.

Pall, bishops', described, 252, &c.
Parker's, Abp., ordination, 107, 265.
Pearson, Bp., on the ancient catalogues of bishops, 220.
Perceval, the Hon. and Rev. A. P., on the case of Judas, 266.
Peter, St., whether ever at Rome? 220.
Popes, catalogues of, 221, &c.—election of, 224—schisms among, 225, &c.—wickedness of, 226,

Pentecostal Assembly